

Woman marries millionaire husband after he insists on prenup, she cheats on him, gets divorced, gets the judge to throw out the prenup.

August 10, 2015 | 1502 upvotes | by [anomanderrape](#)

You may have heard the case of Elizabeth Petrakis, the woman who got her prenup thrown out.

Here is the full story as a reminder:

<http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/headlines/2013/04/n-y-prenup-battle-winner-destroyed-family-with-affair-cousin-says/>

This woman meets a successful millionaire who's built his own fortune through his life's own hard work and investments in real estate.

She wants to marry, being a smart guy he naturally is wary that she could be after his money. She doesn't want to sign a prenup, but he says there is no way they are getting married with out one, so she reluctantly agrees.

Well, come several kids later, she hits the wall and wants a divorce. She claims the prenup is the reason for their marriage falling apart, even though she never was forced into it. She could have always refused the marriage and refused the prenup. But those were his conditions and she accepted it.

Well it turns out she was full of shit. She was cheating on her husband with her cousin's husband. When her cousin comes out against her with this, she has no option but to admit to it. But she still insists her affair wasn't the reason for the marriage falling apart, oh no, she still insists it was the pre-nup.

Here's the real kicker:

She tells the judge that her husband had promised her he would get rid of the prenup after they had children. That's what she says, that he made an oral agreement with her. She has no proof of this promise or this oral agreement, its just his word against hers.

Well the judge believes her, and throws out the prenup, and now she is entitled to half his money, even after she cheated on him, even after he thought he was safe by signing a prenup.

Remember guys, not even a prenuptial agreement can protect you. Marriage can and will destroy you, there is absolutely no point.

Be careful in even entering a de facto marriage before you live. In some countries, being in a LTR with someone where you move in together and live together for some time as de factos can still grant the ex-partner your assets should you break up.

AWALT.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

BaconEggsAndSleaze541 points 10 August, 2015 03:17 PM **[recovered]**

Before Petrakis married Peter Petrakis in 1998, she was presented with what her lawyer called a "heavy handed" prenup that would give her \$25,000 for every year that she and her husband were married, but nothing more.

How many of you would enjoy slapping on \$25k a year to your current salary, just because?

It's never enough.

Petrakis now owns her own business, Divorce Prep Experts, which helps others navigate divorce proceedings.

When you love what you do, you'll never work a day in your life.

rp_divorced • 146 points • 10 August, 2015 04:26 PM

I know my ex loves it because that's what I pay her every year. She works as a secretary 6 hours a day even though she's perfectly healthy and has a masters degree. There is no incentive for her to even try to do better. Now she has a boyfriend who she's already told she'll never marry because she'd have to give up my contractually obligated money on the hope that he won't leave her.

Never get married.

georgeisbusting • 7 points • 11 August, 2015 01:34 PM

Completely agree. The enjoyment a women may give you is not worth having your life destroyed.

I think one of the main problems is women have no more use for us, besides resource, once they bear children. What's true in the animal kingdom is true of us. We no longer need to be around to provide them comfort or enjoyment. Their children now fill whatever void they had initially (which was the instinct to bear children). Once that happens, we're a bank account. Nothing more.

I feel horrible for this man. Everything he has ever worked for is gone. Is this the equality women want? Is it equal to take everything from your spouse or ex? Our society believes so.

If marriage ever comes up, just keep pushing her off until she finds someone else to trap, which she inevitably will if she can't get what she wants out of you. Or simply walk away. Then go eat. Go masturbate. In a few days, you won't care, and there will be such a weight lifted from you. The feeling you get when all the guilt and drama she's piled on you for not marrying her lifts and fades away is far better than any feeling you'll ever get from sex.

All you have to do is walk away. Don't agree to anything. Don't give in. And don't feel bad. She'll rope somebody else. She'll be fine. You're just the guy she has her sights set on right now.

If only this guy had listened to his instincts.

[deleted] • 3 points • 12 August, 2015 06:45 AM

Bro I will beat my dick til it scabs up after reading this. I'll go get the clap from a hooker, FUCK THAT NOISE. Damn man.

Tom_The_Human • 16 points • 10 August, 2015 04:45 PM

Can't you just move countries in cases like these?

rp_divorced • 123 points • 10 August, 2015 04:50 PM

Sure, if I want to abandon my kids and never see them again.

I made my bed and I'll lie in it, but the system is fucked up. I have no motivation to improve myself financially because she can come after me for more money and she has no motivation to improve herself financially because she'll get less money from me that she doesn't have to do any work for.

[deleted] • 39 points • 10 August, 2015 05:19 PM

I feel like this is the kind of thing that leads to an episode of 60 minutes.

[deleted] • 5 points • 10 August, 2015 05:46 PM

I was thinking "When Women Kill" type shows.

[deleted] • 3 points • 11 August, 2015 06:03 AM

Oh! You mean the informative murder porn that's being pushed to make even more women into violent psychopaths!?

[deleted] • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 04:52 PM

Yes. "This week on: 'When Women Kill' we'll see what happens when a wife loses it after losing all *her* money in the divorce because of a prenup!"

[deleted] • 11 points • 11 August, 2015 01:16 AM

Younger men here don't realize the heavy burden those of us who found TRP late pay:

It's not really the money. I could live under a tarp and eat wild berries and make a comeback.

It's the kids. It's really great if you have them to actually live with them

rp_divorced • 8 points • 11 August, 2015 01:35 PM

exactly! I'm paying for being stupid but I have great kids and really enjoy the time I have with them.

I just hope others see this and my other comments and learn to protect and think of themselves first.

alecesne • 8 points • 10 August, 2015 09:56 PM

Divorce => race to the bottom.

trpftw • 4 points • 10 August, 2015 07:57 PM

Wait what exactly do you pay her? Sorry for asking, I'm just wondering what this looks like.

And what % of your salary is she sucking out of you?

rp_divorced • 20 points • 10 August, 2015 08:04 PM

\$24,000 a year in alimony + child support (minimal bc of the amount of alimony she gets).
25% of my salary.

[deleted] 10 August, 2015 08:13 PM

[permanently deleted]

rp_divorced • 25 points • 10 August, 2015 08:18 PM

I'd rather have my freedom than the money.

In today's world where men are disposable, they'd think nothing of locking you up for life with nothing more than circumstantial evidence.

urmomsacct • 3 points • 11 August, 2015 12:16 PM

I truly feel your pain, I too was divorce raped. But, like you, I don't have a choice but to man up and push forward for my child. Depressing and most people will never understand or sympathize. Keep your chin up.

rp_divorced • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 01:37 PM

Depressing and most people will never understand or sympathize

It's so ingrained in our society that the man will always pay that they cheer women for destroying men and their families and never give the man a thought.

trpftw • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 09:37 PM

\$24,000 damn. That's like a wonderful luxury apartment.

So basically you're paying pretty much for her rent in a lavish lifestyle (that is the equivalent).

Does the court base it off of your own salary/income level? 25% is a lot, I wonder if in other cases it's lower or higher.

Also not that I think this can ever happen but what happens if you reconciled with this women and got remarried ? (again I think this is far-fetched but I was wondering for theory sake; was the lifestyle with the wife just as expensive?).

rp_divorced • 6 points • 10 August, 2015 09:55 PM

There's no set formula for alimony in my state. The court bases alimony off the need of one spouse and the ability of the other to pay. Both are very nebulous concepts with a lot of room for interpretation for the judge. They also don't want one spouse to "pass into poverty" as a result of divorce so they try to maintain the marital standard of living...which is impossible when you split up into two households.

The issue was that I was facing lifetime alimony because of the length of my marriage. I made an offer to pay more for less time hoping she wouldn't go for lifetime alimony and she took it. My lawyer said I probably wouldn't have been stuck with lifetime alimony because my ex and I are still relatively young but I would have had to pay for 17 years to match the length of our marriage.

If we got remarried, I would still have to go in front of the judge to ask for my alimony to be terminated, but that's never going to happen. I would rather stab myself in the eye with an icepick.

muuh-gnu • 5 points • 11 August, 2015 05:02 AM

The court bases alimony off the need of one spouse and the ability of the other to pay.

Holy fuck, thats right out of the Marxist playbook: "From each according to his

ability, to each according to his need".

No wonder people are getting reluctant to marry, that sounds right like voluntarily moving to a communist country.

rp_divorced • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 01:39 PM

Marriage in today's world is a pretty good representation of communist principles. Equal distribution of wealth is assumed during the marriage and is the goal of asset distribution during divorce.

trpftw • 3 points • 10 August, 2015 10:35 PM

Wow. Well at least there's some semblance of order in that. A very minor one at that. Definitely still quite unfair to the man.

If you gained custody or sole custody of the kids, would those alimony requirements go away?

rp_divorced • 5 points • 10 August, 2015 11:38 PM

The alimony demands would decrease but it would be another big fight with lawyers and their fees.

rollinstone123 • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 02:55 PM

Can you not get a lawyer to try to make alimony payments only increase with rate of inflation, not with your own income? You are no longer in a partnership so any future success cannot be claimed by her at least in my understanding.

rp_divorced • 3 points • 11 August, 2015 04:00 PM

The good news is that she has a lot of hoops she'd have to go through to get an increase in alimony. The simple fact that I got extra money from somewhere would not be enough. She has to prove a "significant change in circumstance."

The problem is that there is no real definition of "significant". The judge gets to decide what is significant. What she could claim is that her standard of living suffered after the divorce and now I have the income to support that standard of living, therefore, a significant change in circumstance has occurred. A judge just might buy it depending on his mood that day.

When a divorce agreement is negotiated you can make alimony either modifiable or non-modifiable. If it's non-modifiable, she can't come after me for increases, but she gets to keep getting paid even if she remarries. If it's modifiable, she can come after me for more, but I can go after a reduction or removal of alimony if she gets a better job, gets an inheritance, etc.

rollinstone123 • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 04:16 PM

Marriage is terrifying. I'm so glad my parents are still together. A few couples around town have been going through some ugly divorces. It really brings out the worst in people on both sides.

Tom_The_Human • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 06:09 PM

That's understandable, then. How often do you see your kids?

rp_divorced • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 07:57 PM

They're with me 50% of the time. The ex and I alternate weeks. That was the one non-negotiable thing for me.

bebestman • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 10:50 PM

You'd have to change names too, because there are plenty of international agreements for coercing you to pay child support and alimony. Like this.

Tom_The_Human • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 09:18 AM

That is absolute horseshit.

Although, you could just go to one of the grey countries.

HoundDogs • 3 points • 11 August, 2015 03:24 PM

Jesus...what a fucking shit show. Part of me would just want to leave the country. Even if I had to live illegally and in poverty away from my kids...fuck that bitch.

[deleted] • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 03:56 AM

If she gets divorced a second time, does she get twice the alimony?

Nogoodsense • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 04:15 AM

As he stated, if she gets married again his alimony is forfeit.

If she then divorces the next husband, then yes, she would possibly get it from that guy.

Not from two guys at the same time.

Fred_Flintstone • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 03:44 PM

Now she has a boyfriend who she's already told she'll never marry because she'd have to give up my contractually obligated money on the hope that he won't leave her.

"What do you mean you dont want to marry me?! I know we love each other and marriage is not necessary to show that, but marriage is about so much more than money. It is about showing someone you love them and committing to them. I will leave you if you do not marry me."

"I cant marry you as i will lose the alimony from my previous marriage, but we can just be long term boyfriend and girlfriend OK?"

rp_divorced • 3 points • 11 August, 2015 04:04 PM

How much of a beta bucks do you have to be to agree to that situation?!? I get a good laugh every time I see him and think about the shit he puts up with.

cptspiffy • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 06:59 PM **[recovered]**

I'm surprised that she's working at all. Sorry that happened to you.

rp_divorced • 12 points • 10 August, 2015 07:06 PM

She has to. She can't support her shopping habits on my alimony alone. Thank you.

Nogoodsense • 3 points • 11 August, 2015 04:17 AM

Even with the new minimum wage proposal of \$15/hour. A full time worker makes about \$20k after taxes etc. Not exactly a comfortable lifestyle in most parts of the country.

ThePedanticCynic • 3 points • 10 August, 2015 07:35 PM

Now she has a boyfriend who she's already told she'll never marry because she'd have to give up my contractually obligated money on the hope that he won't leave her.

This is exactly the risk every man takes in a marriage, and i don't know why few people can see it or it's considered misogynistic to bring it up. You got married, therefore you put a portion of your paycheck on the line in the hopes that she wouldn't leave you. She's in exactly the same situation, and she's choosing not to get married!

[deleted] • 2 points • 12 August, 2015 06:46 AM

Wow good point, that's like a woman being a man's situation for marriage, and saying NO!

[deleted] • 202 points • 10 August, 2015 03:42 PM

The major mistake here was that the pre-nup was signed only days before the wedding. As we know, the legal/political system treats women like defenseless victims with no agency so her lawyer argued that she was "coerced" into signing the prenup.

In previous prenup discussions on this subreddit, some lawyers stated that you should have the prenup signed well in advance of the wedding. Ideally, you should not even agree to marriage until the document is signed. The wedding should be scheduled after the prenup is executed. If you keep documents for when you scheduled the venue etc., this can be easily proved.

It's also a good idea to make sure that the wife has her own legal counsel. That way no one can make the argument that she was somehow duped.



zyk0s • 233 points • 10 August, 2015 05:56 PM*

I love how people insist that prenups protect your assets, *as long as you do it correctly*. But that's like saying climbing the Everest is perfectly safe, as long as you have the right equipment and preparation. You can always analyze a case that didn't go well, and point to the things people should have done differently. What makes prenups and climbing the Everest so dangerous is precisely the fact that there are many, many ways things can go wrong, and even hired professionals get it wrong sometimes.

This millionaire wasn't an idiot, he had enough money to hire a very good lawyer, and thought he was getting very good legal advice. But it failed, and even if we can now deconstruct it and explain why it failed, that does not make prenups any less dangerous.

ThePedanticCynic • 36 points • 10 August, 2015 07:31 PM

But it failed, and even if we can now deconstruct it and explain why it failed, that does not make ~~prenups~~ marriage any less dangerous.

You're right that prenups are dangerous though, because it provides a false sense of security. They're the illusion that marriage can ever be a safe proposition for men.

MyPaynis • 8 points • 10 August, 2015 08:30 PM

Can he sue the attorney that did the prenup for him? I'm sure the attorney presented it as a

document that protected his money and that didn't end up happening.

zyk0s • 25 points • 10 August, 2015 09:14 PM

You wish! Suing an attorney is harder than suing a cop who mistreated you. Courts won't allow it for at least the practical reason of avoiding an unending flow of countersuits. But even if you could find an exception, who runs the show? You'll agree it would be unwise to resolve a dispute with a plumber by challenging him to a plumbing contest.

zaiguy • 18 points • 10 August, 2015 11:02 PM

That's fucked up. So the courts can and will rip up and throw out a legally binding contract at will, but don't you dare sue one of our own!

If the law isn't worth more than a scrap of paper and can be arbitrarily ignored or enforced by those in power, then we have truly entered a dark age.

NO_LAH_WHERE_GOT • 15 points • 11 August, 2015 12:22 AM

If the law isn't worth more than a scrap of paper and can be arbitrarily ignored or enforced by those in power, then we have truly entered a dark age.

We never left it. The great tragedy is that the large-scale *pretense* that we somehow did.

TheRiseAndFall • 8 points • 10 August, 2015 11:56 PM

Welcome to America! It's like Russia, but the crooks have a formal process you have to go through before you pay your bribe, or they brake your knee cups

ThePedanticCynic • 3 points • 11 August, 2015 08:40 AM

Not exactly true. In Russia you're allowed to physically defend yourself from such aggression. In the US you are simply labeled a felon and barred from ever being a human being again.

The centralization and criminalization of such activities as 'fatherhood' has essentially neutralized any notion of justice.

rpscrote • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 09:20 PM*

Not true. You can definitely sue your attorney. In fact, attorney spend a shit load of time and money on malpractice concerns and malpractice insurance. Anyone who acts like you can't sue your attorney is dead wrong and hasn't had much contact with the legal services industry. Now obviously, if you're going to a competent attorney they will use their competence to protect themselves too. If your attorney left huge gaps in his own protection you should probably get a new attorney.

Just because something went wrong doesn't mean it was your attorney's fault. I guarantee you any family law attorney, even ones that passed the bar a month ago, will tell you YOU HAVE TO MAKE SURE THERE IS NO COERCION!! It's super, super basic black letter law. Im not even in family law or anything remotely close and I can tell you that

The millionaire probably just didnt follow closely enough the advice he was given. Which happens extremely often. Far more often than you'd think considering you gotta

pay this guy thousands just to get his opinion. Either that or there actually was more than enough time between prenup signature and the wedding but the judge is making up an excuse to find the result he wants, which is also pretty common.

MyPaynis • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 10:50 PM

I understand what you are saying. This is my thought process. If I pay a licensed attorney and he provides me with a legal contract that he tells me will protect me from losing X amount of dollars if signed by 2 parties like any business contract and then the contract that he creates for me after payment to do so does not hold up legally to protect the X amount of dollars I would see that as willful neglect or some form of failure to provide services paid for. If a plumber tells me he will fix my toilet and make it flush for \$100.00, we sign a contract stating the same and I pay him for the service, if he does not fix the toilet and make it flush I can sue him. If you pay someone for a service and they do not complete the service correctly they should be held liable and accountable. If a prenup is not airtight based on the rules given in the prenup they should not receive payment for offering this service that does not deliver on its promises. If I had an attorney draw up a contract to buy half a company and then after I pay for half of the company I find out that the contract was not valid and I lost my money and got zero percent of the company I'm sure. I could sue the attorney.

warjesus420 • 8 points • 11 August, 2015 01:01 AM

Should-land is a wonderful place. Where women's mouths are incapable of forming words and only used for one thing. Should-land where men aren't taken advantage of and screwed over in every way. Ahhh should-land. But sadly we don't live in should-land.

MyPaynis • 3 points • 11 August, 2015 01:51 AM

I wanna go to Should land. Sounds beautiful.

zyk0s • 3 points • 10 August, 2015 11:30 PM*

If I had an attorney draw up a contract to buy half a company and then after I pay for half of the company I find out that the contract was not valid and I lost my money and got zero percent of the company I'm sure. I could sue the attorney.

You could have a case if you could somehow prove malicious intent, for instance that he was paid by the other party to the contract to make it fail. And then, I'm not even sure you could sue him, you'd probably want to file a complaint against the bar. Otherwise, there's really nothing you can do. Lawyers don't guarantee results, they provide a service, which is representation, contract drafting according to what you express to be your wish (and the only way to be sure what that is is to have a contract). But because they don't give any guarantees, their entire career rests on their reputation. If you are an important client, and they fuck up, they know the news of their failure will be spread far and wide, and they'll lose business. Like for ebay sellers, your best defense is to check their reputation before you hire them. How many prenups have they drafted? How many of them were upheld completely, how many got partly rejected and how many got thrown out completely? What was the worth of their clients. That's really all you can do.

Sadpanda596 • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 03:33 PM

Lawyer here, this is actually literally exactly how it works (there is a lot of misinformation in this thread). The only real difference is that suing lawyers for negligence gets particularly rough. You can only get your money back if you can prove that you would have won money in the underlying suit. Thus, you have to basically win two cases: show that your lawyer was negligent and that you would have won the original case that you lost if he hadn't been incompetent. Needless to say, lawyers have to fuck up very very hard to have to pay out in a negligence suit (also, they have insurance for that anyways.)

alecesne • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 09:53 PM

If the attorney followed the rules and did his professional best, he is not liable for an arbitrary or biased judge, that's for a court of appeals to resolve.

MyPaynis • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 10:50 PM

I understand what you are saying. This is my thought process. If I pay a licensed attorney and he provides me with a legal contract that he tells me will protect me from losing X amount of dollars if signed by 2 parties like any business contract and then the contract that he creates for me after payment to do so does not hold up legally to protect the X amount of dollars I would see that as willful neglect or some form of failure to provide services paid for. If a plumber tells me he will fix my toilet and make it flush for \$100.00, we sign a contract stating the same and I pay him for the service, if he does not fix the toilet and make it flush I can sue him. If you pay someone for a service and they do not complete the service correctly they should be held liable and accountable. If a prenup is not airtight based on the rules given in the prenup they should not receive payment for offering this service that does not deliver on its promises. If I had an attorney draw up a contract to buy half a company and then after I pay for half of the company I find out that the contract was not valid and I lost my money and got zero percent of the company I'm sure. I could sue the attorney.

alecesne • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 02:59 PM

Companies plan mergers and then separate all the time. Sometimes a lot of assets change hands and elements of a deal get thrown out or interpreted in crazy ways. The major difference is that judges often assume corporations are sophisticated entities, so are unlikely to throw the entire agreement out. If one of the parties entering the merger was exerting undue force or influence though, that is taken into consideration.

If you want to sue the attorney, you have to show that he did something unethical, or something other than what a competent attorney would have done or not done. (e.g., this attorney didn't tell the guy that he should get her to sign the document in advance, or didn't mention that including an infidelity clause).

spectrum_92 • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 02:09 AM

Not sure what country you're from but here in Australia (which is a common law country), legal advocates are immune from being sued for negligence. I believe in the UK it's possible in some cases, not sure about the US though.

MyPaynis • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 02:12 AM

I'm in the U.S. Where you can sue anyone, anytime for anything.

Lazlo-Red • 3 points • 11 August, 2015 12:45 PM*

Prenups are a prophylactic measure; like a condom, they work most of the time but can break with tragic results. This example demonstrates how everything was done incorrectly when negotiating a prenup. As soon as the woman puts up too much resistance to the prenup, the wedding is off. PERIOD!

I advise my clients that the prenup is the starting point of divorce negotiations. Prenups are just the first line of defense. If you get married and have money, your life will revolve around the prenup and the money. I kid you not! I wrote a solid prenup and postnup for a friend and his wife, every time we hung out, she would mention the fact that she could not get to his money. She made a play, lost, and they are still together. The prenup & postnup saved his marriage, for whatever that is worth.

Any child support (departing gifts) is separate from the prenup and cannot be negotiated prior to marriage. This is where most men get screwed because it is determined later. Think about how Kevin Federline gets his bills paid – there was a solid prenup in his game and he just blew by it to a life of leisure by getting custody of the kids.

Overkillengine • 6 points • 10 August, 2015 11:10 PM

Indeed, the only sure way not to fall off a mountain is to not climb it.

I'm sure someone will menstruate out an "argument" that risk-averse behavior means one will get nowhere in life.

Those same people are welcome to bet me their life savings on a coin flip. Heads I get it all, tails, they keep what they have....for now.

Much like the above coin flip, taking risks heedlessly is fucking stupid if there is nothing to be gained from it that could be obtained without said risk to begin with.

zyk0s • 13 points • 10 August, 2015 11:45 PM

That has been every single argument that I heard from marriage, once I explained that I didn't feel like gambling with all the assets I have acquired in life so far. That has been the argument from my parents: "but son, you can't just live your life being afraid, you'll end up lonely and miserable! We too have taken a risk, we didn't know what life would bring us blah blah blah". Yes, they took a "risk" in a country and at a time where divorce was something shameful, and someone knew someone who had an aunt who divorced a known alcoholic and that was it.

I'm pretty risk averse myself, but I'd sooner quit my job and invest half of everything I own into a business venture. That's risk I can manage, that's risk that I am in control of. And if it fails and I lose everything, at least I won't have to pay dividends to that failed company for the rest of my life.

donttelltthefamily • 15 points • 10 August, 2015 10:36 PM

When a man is coerced he's a weak willed, pathetic individual not capable of standing up for himself. When a women is coerced she's a victim of manipulation. Shit's fucked

The major mistake here was ~~that the pre-nup....~~ *getting married*

It's getting pretty damn old reading all you "Red Pill" hamsters justifying this horrendously stupid decision time and time again.

AWALT, dummies

CyrieYourGod • 19 points • 10 August, 2015 08:17 PM*

First off, if you want children who--statistically speaking--turn out better you should get married. Wanting children to grow up in a stable home is not crazy. Even children understand that when their parents aren't married, there is inherent instability.

Second, partnerships are about control and mutual interests. If you choose a woman who is brought up in a family where divorce is shamed and stable households are preached, they will be less inclined to get divorced even during the rough patches even if it's "for the kids". Don't date and marry party girls.

Thirdly, always get a pre-nup.

Independentmale • 22 points • 10 August, 2015 09:23 PM

First off, if you want children who--statistically speaking--turn out better you should get married.

Bullshit. Children turn out better with a mother and father living under the same roof. A piece of paper issued by the state has nothing to do with this, and said piece of paper is worthless in terms of keeping families together. If anything, current family court laws and precedence *encourages* women to divorce their husbands, promising cash and prizes and a continuing income stream.

politicalwave • 6 points • 11 August, 2015 02:24 AM

Doesn't that scenario you describe fall into the de facto marriage category?

Independentmale • 3 points • 11 August, 2015 04:01 AM

I'm not sure what you mean. If you're talking about common law marriage, it's only valid in a few US states. In most areas you can safely live with a woman forever and not wind up automatically married.

What I'm suggesting is this: If a man is inclined to get married, he should play married instead. You can live and have and raise children together without a marriage contract and unless you're one of the unfortunate few in a common law jurisdiction, it's relatively safe.

Mr_Andry • 1 point • 15 August, 2015 01:31 AM

I was under the impression that a failed cohabitation was nearly as dangerous to a man's finances as a failed marriage. Many people have advised never to let a woman stay over at your place more than twice a week.

I'd love to see an authoritative source on this.

Melocatones • 3 points • 11 August, 2015 01:07 PM

Yes, and he's pointing out that de facto and de jure marriage aren't different to the kids- so why get legally married?

SpawnQuixote • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 02:38 AM

Yes, but they aren't marrying you. They are marrying the state with you being the resource provider. Haven't you guys figured that out yet?

spectrum_92 • 6 points • 11 August, 2015 02:14 AM

If you choose a woman who is brought up in a family where divorce is shamed and stable households are preached, they will be less inclined to get divorced even during the rough patches even if it's "for the kids"

I can't agree with this enough. In most of these disastrous divorce cases the women are all pretty much the same - useless, washed-up cum dumpsters that run their own 'interior design' business when they're not shopping and travelling without their husband.

Now at risk of breaking the 'AWALT' mantra, regardless of whether all women are susceptible to fantasising about cheating or divorce, there are plenty of women whose families would not tolerate that sort of behaviour from them, and the risk of being socially ostracised from their own friends and family is dramatically worse than the material gains of sexual satisfaction and a hefty divorce payout.

Admittedly, it's getting harder and harder to find women from families like that in the west, but they do exist.

NakedAndBehindYou • 3 points • 11 August, 2015 12:21 AM

Wanting children to grow up in a stable home is not crazy.

Being married does not make a "stable" home. As you can see by the vast number of divorces.

A stable home is made by two stable adults who know what they are doing in a relationship. Before you get into a LTR, know what you want, and know that your partner wants the same thing.

[deleted] • 2 points • 12 August, 2015 06:01 PM

Horrible advice.

The risk vs reward doesn't compute. The risk is very high and the reward is low.

It simply doesn't make sense for a man to marry these days (unless she's loaded). Any other conclusion is hamstering.

CreateTheFuture • 4 points • 10 August, 2015 08:18 PM

Are you new here or just actively ignorant?

[deleted] • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 02:14 AM

Wanting children to grow up in a stable home is not crazy.

You don't need to sign a legal document to have that.

trpftw • 0 points • 10 August, 2015 07:53 PM

I disagree. You also don't need to be insulting about it. Some people do like marriage and exclusive relationships. Just because you don't doesn't mean that's how it should be.

Frankly_George8 points 11 August, 2015 02:49 AM [recovered]

Some people do like marriage.

Marriage 1.0 is no longer available to purchase at any price.

Paid_Internet_Troll • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 09:10 AM

Marriage 1.0 is no longer available to purchase at any price.

Depends on where you're willing to live.

You'll notice that there aren't a lot of stories from Dubai, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Malaysia, or Indonesia, about women cheating on their husbands and then getting huge divorce settlements afterwards.

CreateTheFuture • 24 points • 10 August, 2015 07:56 PM

It's not about exclusive relationships; it's about willingly signing over your property rights to an untrustworthy person for *literally nothing in return*. You're an idiot for agreeing to it in the first place.

RemyPrice • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 03:43 AM

I like the idea of marriage.

And, I hate marriage.

Source: Was married.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 07:52 AM

If I got to keep half your shit plus other incentives I would love marriage and exclusive relationships too.

HumanSockPuppet • 6 points • 10 August, 2015 10:49 PM

Wrong. The major mistake here was getting married.

Transmigratory • 3 points • 10 August, 2015 08:57 PM*

Another thing could be to have a review clause every X years. The courts may say that a prenup Y years ago don't meet her needs (BS, I know).

The review clause ensures that you factor in things like kids.

The trick with that is to hold frame.

Of course, guys who roped in women with the whole "prenups are the only way I know you just don't want money" ethos would have an easier time doing it this way.

Two things to also consider:

Think extremely carefully, if you have a high standard of living the courts for some silly reason believe the divorce should leave the other party with the same standard of living they had in the marriage.

If she refuses to sign the prenup initially, just next her. Plate her if she comes back because resistance to sign a prenup at any stage shows this shit will happen as Mr. Millionaire found out.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 06:58 AM

Think extremely carefully, if you have a high standard of living the courts for some silly reason believe the divorce should leave the other party with the same standard of living they had in the marriage.

This escapes me. All of this does, but this too. I GAVE HER that standard of living. She got it because I provided for her in exchange for fucking me. When we're not together, she can go find someone else, or fend for herself. Isn't that fucking logic?

Transmigratory • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 01:51 PM

I know, I know. It baffles me too. My only reason for that is the whole "women are victims" notion, that's why without a well designed prenup (whereby you'll have to invest prior to ensure her needs with this BS are met) courts do this stupid thing. In fact prenups are probably thrown out BECAUSE of that.

Lesser evil I guess, have some sort of insurance plan during the marriage to use in the divorce. Or bank roll her for life.

Of course some will talk about household contributions, but beware the women are wonderful phenomenon. The only way around that is to portray her as greedy, the only way to do that is a costly insurance plan like ensure she has a place to stay (so you keep your home) etc.

Logic, there be none. Well I guess if anything you can say the state doesn't want to take care of her, so in order to reduce govt spending, they fuck the guy over since now the matriarchal forces that be influence this shit.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 05:21 PM

It's so fucking stupid though. Why does she get a BETTER standard of living than me, with more of MY income, when IT'S MINE. She can "tough it out a bit" especially if she initiated the fucking divorce. Part of the downsides of not being with me, and are not using my money. Jesus Christ dude I can't even imagine giving some ungrateful bitch money to go off and get fucked in MY house. I-I could not do that. I would hire a homeless person or some shit.

Transmigratory • 2 points • 12 August, 2015 11:42 PM

It doesn't help that society is against male issues, for instance if we said the same shit but swapped genders... we know how the public perception would be.

Well we gotta keep pushing and maybe eventually, possibly beyond our lifetimes, it'll change.

tekn0_ • 3 points • 10 August, 2015 04:17 PM

How long before the wedding should the prenup be signed ?

[deleted] • 85 points • 10 August, 2015 05:13 PM

Never. Because you shouldnt get married.

Captain_Unremarkable • 11 points • 10 August, 2015 06:11 PM

Or, if you *really* want to get married:

1. Do everything legally possible to ensure your prenup is as far away from "coercion" as possible.

2. Set up a financial failsafe plan just in case, most likely establishing a trust fund for yourself and/or using offshore accounts

But then again, I'm just never getting married.

Furrealyo • 3 points • 11 August, 2015 04:32 AM

If anyone reads this thread and still thinks marriage is a good idea in *any* circumstance, they are beyond help and deserve what, statistically, will happen to them.

veggie_girl • 48 points • 10 August, 2015 05:30 PM*

Expert reporting in.

You'll want two documents and two signings. The first is your prenup agreement that is to be signed a minimum 3 months but recommended 1 year before the marriage takes place. The second is to be done right before the marriage, it is your admission papers to a mental hospital because you're insane for getting married.

In all seriousness, have you ever read the actual default marriage contract that is validated when you'd get married? Any sane person would not consent to it if they had.

Demonspawn • 15 points • 10 August, 2015 08:08 PM

In all seriousness, have you ever read the actual default marriage contract that is validated when you'd get married? Any sane person would not consent to it if they had.

Which I find funny... If a prenup was as harsh as the default marriage contract, it would be thrown out for being far too advantageous to one party.

LeFlamel • 8 points • 10 August, 2015 07:34 PM

College kid here, how bad is the rape by legalese on marriage agreements?

veggie_girl • 3 points • 11 August, 2015 04:29 AM

It depends somewhat on where you live. It also depends on what you have to lose.

If you're a broke couple with no kids and no property, not much changes when you divorce. You file Pro Se and go about your ways. *But if you're financially destitute, you shouldn't be working any LTR of any sort anyway.*

Now as far as where to live I'm not an expert on anywhere non-US because the laws vary so drastically. In the US, financially, there are 9 states that are somewhat favorable towards marriage.

Arizona

California

Idaho

Louisiana

Nevada

New Mexico

Texas

Washington

Wisconsin

These are states that use community property laws vs. the 50/50 equitable distribution system.

With community property any assets you had prior to the marriage remain yours. However any assets acquired during the marriage are split. It's favorable to other states because equitable distribution means everything is up for grabs, and often times a prenup is thrown out if the divorce will leave a vast financial imbalance between the two individuals. But, in either system, regardless of what the law says, the system favors women in divorce. If you're a man you will need an excellent lawyer to protect yourself.

Some states have different grounds on which divorce is allowed. Others allow for no-fault divorces. Generally, the only difference is that a duration of legal separation is required prior to divorcing in states that don't offer a no-fault divorce.

Now if you have kids, all bets are off. Prepare to lose full custody of them to the mother. Short of her being in a mental hospital or prison, as a man you are going to be the bad guy if she says you are the bad guy. In almost all locations, prepare to be on the hook for child support, spousal support, and secondary custody. The benefit of not getting married here is that without the marriage, you generally are only on the hook for a minimum child support (based on your taxable income) and custody is more or less the same difficulty in obtaining. But, as opposed to a divorce, without the marriage the woman is not going to be automatically granted these rights. She will have to take extra steps and make extra petitions to gain the same advantages that divorce would have granted her. *Many women do not follow through with this.*

Long story short. If you get married in the wrong place and/or without the right protection, prepare to be devastated. During the dissolution process you can lose your money, your children, and in some circumstances your freedom (such as in at-fault divorce states a woman might claim her reason for divorcing you was rape).

[deleted] • 3 points • 10 August, 2015 04:36 PM

A few years would be better. Until family law attorneys start commenting on this thread I wouldn't read to many comments.

Magnum256 • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 12:44 AM

The problem is that this case makes it sound like reluctance is some kind of legal defense, and if that's the case then the woman having her lawyer there wouldn't really change that.

Husbands lawyer: Here's the prenup, sign it lady.

Wife: But... I don't really want to, I mean do we really need to do this bby?

Husband: I won't get married without a pre-nup.

Wifes lawyer: it's your choice, you can sign it or not

Wife: ok i'll sign it

Years later...

Wife: I never wanted to sign it in the first place! I felt pressured!

[deleted] • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 03:05 AM*

In this case the wedding was already planned, invitations were sent out, RSVPs were received and the final preparations were being made. You can see how the duress argument is much easier to make in this case. "Your Honor, could you imagine the shame and humiliation of telling the many family members, dear friends and other guests that the wedding was off? She put in countless hours

preparing for this wedding that she dreamed of her entire life only to be blindsided by a sudden ultimatum. This man might as well have put a gun to my client's head!"

It's much harder to make that argument if she agreed to a prenup before the wedding was even scheduled. It's even better if it was signed before the engagement was announced. If she had her own lawyer advising her, it makes it even harder to claim that she was pressured. Really? By her own counsel? Sure the husband could have walked, but she had plenty of time to think it over plus legal representation to walk her through the process.

MGHOW_ATL • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 04:52 PM

If you insist on swimming in a lake of fire, ya gotta wear asbestos trunks. If I ever thought about tying the knot, it would be only under these conditions below. If she balks at any point, then she's not someone to bind lives together with.

Draw up your prenup with your lawyer, incl will-style prose to the effect of "can only be superseded by legal paperwork", ie no informal promises or statements, etc. She gets her own lawyer (her dime, not yours) and they read it. Depending on haggle room, allow the lawyers to talk it over. Don't talk about it at all with her informally, period. When all is ready, all 4 meet with witnesses, all parties sign off, notarize, and copies to each. Video/audio record as well. Then and only then does she get to take my name and bear my children.

Marriage is essentially a business merger; treat it as such.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 11:21 PM

Very wise ideas indeed. Unfortunately, a family court still has the discretion to rule that a prenup was "unreasonable" as well. So it's important to make sure that in the event of a divorce she still gets something if you earn far more than her. Your wealth will take a hit but the key is to make it manageable and not catastrophic.

While there are horror stories like this one, many other wealthy men kept most of their wealth thorough well-executed agreements. Take Elon Musk for example. His ex-wife will still be far richer than 99.9% of people on this planet, but he walked away relatively unscathed and was soon dating a 27 year old actress.

Oil billionaire Harold Hamm was worth \$10+ billion. His wife got \$1 billion in the divorce but that still wasn't enough! She tried to sue for more but she lost the case.

Meglomaniac • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 11:46 PM

This is exactly the case here.

The problem was is it wasn't a pre-established requirement. For all we know he sprung it upon her in the couple days before the wedding and it WAS signed under duress.

The moral of the story is that if you want to get married with a prenup, tell her way way way early and make your feelings known to men you trust around you.

SPICY_BUTT_MILK • 26 points • 10 August, 2015 06:22 PM

When you love what you do, you'll never work a day in your life.

I laughed out loud at that...laughter that sort of trailed off into a grim expression.

RPthrowaway123 • 6 points • 10 August, 2015 03:58 PM

Since she's living off his money I doubt she'll work a day regardless...

_eskimo_brothers_ • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 06:49 PM*

Uh, an extra \$25k would do most people a world of favors, if just to get out of debt quickly, pay off house, and actually save for retirement.

I bet she has clickbait ads out there, "I make more barely working, with this one trick, you can too!"

DO NOT GET MARRIED.

Oh look. Another instance of a cheating women, hot off relationships subreddit:

<https://archive.is/KQten>

I know as a group we're basically split on telling the husband, but it seems to have worked out alright in this guy's favor. He owned up once he knew, even provided the husband with proof. Oh, and she gave OP (the other man) anal, never gave it to the husband. Of course right?

The only conceivable way I'd ever get married is if everything was in trusts with trustworthy lawyers and accountants so if shit hits the fan, oh that's too bad, corporations own all of my money and assets, the greedy bitch would get nothing, maybe paperwork has her on the books as a consultant to the business, she receives a yearly stipend but if she creates an emotional problem for other employees (IE: ME) she forfeits her salary. When you break it down to a business deal, wouldn't the women rather not be tied to so much legal paperwork? Make it such a pain to marry you that completely protects you, and then how much do they really need the marriage license when it no longer gives her absolute power. Just spitballin' now.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 07:00 AM

You spittin fire son, keep talking

CopperFox3c • 239 points • 10 August, 2015 03:08 PM*

This happens all the time in the U.S. ... Listen boys: prenups are not some ironclad defense against getting divorce-raped. They can, and are, thrown out at the whim of the judge all the time.

The point is: don't get fucking married until the laws change. And if for some reason you decide to anyway, well you better be really really sure, and even then pray for the best. Given the right time and circumstances: AWAALT. It's on you, you have been warned.

[deleted] • 52 points • 10 August, 2015 03:27 PM

Whenever we have prenup discussions, usually a lawyer posts that this stuff doesn't happen all the time and that the best way to go about prenups is to get the female's lawyers to review the agreement as well as your own.

So, what did this guy do wrong?

CopperFox3c • 59 points • 10 August, 2015 03:34 PM

A judge at any point can declare a contract null and void if he/she sees grounds for it. It's all interpretation. And given our current gynocentric culture in the West, he-said/she-said situations are often gonna come down on the side of the woman. That is exactly what happened here.

There is really no ironclad protection for the man. Prenups provide some defense, but your best bet is to not get married. Not until the laws change.

[deleted] • 37 points • 10 August, 2015 05:18 PM

The only way to win is not to play.

[deleted] • 6 points • 10 August, 2015 03:43 PM

Just curious, are you a lawyer?

CopperFox3c • 60 points • 10 August, 2015 03:47 PM

Nope, but my father is. I've had extensive conversations with him about this topic. His words: *The law is just a piece of paper, the only thing that counts is the interpretation of it.*

trpftw • 10 points • 10 August, 2015 08:05 PM

Can you ask your dad or (if a lawyer here can comment), that what if the prenup had language like this:

"The parties agree that no oral argument or any exception or modification can be made to this agreement and that there will be zero decision in the future to overturn this prenup unless specifically stated and agreed upon by both parties in a subsequent signed document."

How can any judge reinterpret that to void the contract? The contract is basically saying that there will be no oral agreements or exceptions.

Unless the woman can prove that she was under duress or threatened to sign (in which case, why not go to the police right then and there?). That should mean that it can never be overturned unless duress/coercion was claimed in a police report relatively soon after signing.

I cannot imagine even the most mentally disturbed judge overturning that. Even if it miraculously got overturned, a simple appeal should overturn that decision.

CopperFox3c • 14 points • 10 August, 2015 08:50 PM*

Actually, a lot of prenups are being superseded by judges' concerns over the "well-being of the children." So coercion isn't necessary to prove in many cases.

Any contract that violates other laws, or endangers people (especially vulnerable populations like children) is subject to being thrown out as null and void. At least, this is the way family courts have sometimes been interpreting it. It's kind of fucked up IMO, but family courts have different legal standards than a normal civil or bankruptcy court that would handle, e.g., a dispute between business parties.

Basically, the point is no matter how you word it, if she gets really good lawyers and can find a chink in the armor, there is the possibility it will get thrown out.

trpftw • 3 points • 10 August, 2015 08:54 PM

I see. It's interesting.

But wouldn't it be as simple as, you're paying for everything for the kids ? And if your wife has a job too, shouldn't she also have to pay for the kids? I mean, if you give money to your wife to "support the kids when you're not around", shouldn't the wife also be giving money to "support the kids, when she is not around"? Assuming that both are financially stable?

I am getting this sense that a lot of prenup nightmares are because the wife is a housewife or doesn't really have much of a job, or a really crappy part time job. Hence the court feels the need to help her out by taking money from the husband in order for her to take care of her kids. Or has it just gotten to the point where those factors aren't even factored in?

CopperFox3c • 5 points • 10 August, 2015 08:59 PM

But how is she gonna pay the mortgage on the 5000 square-foot McMansion she took from you in the divorce?? Lord knows the kids can't be living in a normal 1800 square-foot Craftsman house in the burbs ... that's just crazy talk. /s

While at the same time, you're living in a 500 sq ft studio efficiency apartment across the tracks in the seedy part of town ... SMH

trpftw • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 09:40 PM

Hmm damn, I find that very strange you know. You would think the courts would be more reasonable or fair.

alecesne • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 10:16 PM

Family law is designed to maintain the children's standard of living; the bias is introduced in which parent typically gets custody-

alecesne • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 10:14 PM

Having fancy language in the prenup about it not being coerced is helpful, but not dispositive. What you need to show is that there were negotiations, well in advance of the wedding, and that both parties understood and freely reached the final agreement. If you have a draft prenup where she asks for a little more, and you agree to that, its helpful; if you have specific language about infidelity, its helpful; if you add a clause about custody of children going to the party that did not have an affair, it takes a major arrow out of her quiver, but you're never completely out of the woods.

trpftw • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 10:24 PM

I can't imagine that you can never completely be out of the woods. Just based on probability.

I can't get out of renter's agreement no matter how dire the circumstances are for me, or how unfairly they treat me. I can't imagine the law being so flexible enough to completely make worthless a well-established and well-written contract, along with factors showing that it could never be duress unless there is a criminal case.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 11:28 AM

Basically, society allows women to retrospectively change their minds any time they want. Doesn't matter what they consented to at the time.

Lazlo-Red • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 04:17 PM

Prenups get overturned... Just like a condom, when they break, there can be disastrous results. Contracts may be overturned or disregarded, regardless of the terms, due to public policy, federal legal issues and fraud in the inducement (among many other reasons). Appeal does not help if there are reasonable grounds outside the agreement to overturn the prenup.

Read this if you are really interested:

http://www.aaml.org/sites/default/files/MAT210_1.pdf

Even these clauses get overturned: This Agreement contains the entire agreement between

the parties and supersedes any prior understandings or written or oral agreements between the parties relating to the subject matter of this Agreement, except as may be otherwise provided in this Agreement.

AND

This Agreement may not be amended or waived except in a writing executed by the party against which such amendment or waiver is sought to be enforced. No course of dealing between or among any persons having any interest in this Agreement will be deemed effective to modify or amend any part of this Agreement or any rights or obligations of any person under or by reason of this Agreement.

Many of posters don't understand that a pre-nup does not limit child support. The court typically looks to income, regardless of the terms of the pre-nup, to set the amount of support. Somewhere in this mass of postings I posted an example of how some people get screwed AND a pre-nup does not provide any protection.

FYI: child support equals free reign to take income even if not married.

trpftw • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 06:00 PM

This is ridiculous. Do you think this type of problem is unique to America or to the whole Western world? I don't understand how a contract can be overridden unless there is some criminal fraud or violence of some kind that creates an exigent circumstance.

I cannot understand how a contract can be overturned. Does that mean I can overturn my leasing agreement if I argue that I was pressured and that we made an oral agreement that because of my job the community manager would let me off the contract?

FYI: child support equals free reign to take income even if not married.

Yeah I figured that if some woman wants to screw you, she'll find a way. So this is why I don't know if it's even worth worrying about. There are so many legal ways that women can mess up your life just by meeting you.

rpsscrote • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 09:32 PM

The parties agree that no oral argument or any exception or modification can be made to this agreement and that there will be zero decision in the future to overturn this prenup unless specifically stated and agreed upon by both parties in a subsequent signed document

I am a lawyer.

You can not bind a court in a private agreement in any way. The court would look at this clause and throw it out. You have no authority over the court's ability to adjudicate the prenup.

trpftw • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 09:49 PM

Then that weakens contracts for sure. So that means if I sign a contract for a business deal, then later one side doesn't have to agree to the terms and they'll demand it in court and a judge might comply and accept it. How do contracts have meaning if they can be overturned on a whim with clauses being thrown out with no duress/physical-

violence/criminal-fraud being found?

rpscrote • 1 point • 13 August, 2015 04:35 PM

there is a different coercion standard for prenups than for general business contracts. The coercion standard for prenups is much easier to meet. In fact, prenups are considered primarily a family law topic and secondarily a contract though in reality its the other way around. Its harder to throw out a regular contract than it is to throw out a prenup

Google "procedural unconscionability" and "substantive unconscionability." Not all states do substantive unconscionability, but that topic is one of the ways you can get out of contracts without duress or fraud. But yes, the right to contract in america is nowhere near as strong as it once was.

That's not even to mention the numerous ways you can get additional terms into a relationship by law outside of the contract specifically. Promissory estoppel, restitution, tort based relationship duties...

trpftw • 1 point • 13 August, 2015 06:43 PM

It's quite insane. Just a watering down of laws and contracts.

Basically, no matter who is richer or has more to lose, by entering a marriage even with a pre-nup contract, they are literally taking gigantic risks. It's an inherently unfair system and the courts and congress needs to correct it. The law shouldn't be able to be bent to the favor of someone who has less to lose.

sardinemanR • 55 points • 10 August, 2015 04:12 PM

That's usually because they're crappy lawyers, or law students that don't know what they're talking about, but want to sound like they do.

I live in a major metropolitan area and know the best divorce attorney in the region. Quite possible the best in the country/world.

He is not married. I once asked him if he ever thought of getting married. Unprompted, these were his words:

"If I ever want to get married, I will just find a woman I hate and buy her a house."

No joke.

[deleted] • 17 points • 10 August, 2015 07:30 PM

"If I ever want to get married, I will just find a woman I hate and buy her a house."

That's a quote from Lewis Grizzard. Other funny guys from that period, like Woody Allen and Rodney Dangerfield, had similar things to say about marriage. I particularly like this one from Rodney:

"My wife and I were happy for twenty years. Then we met."

trpftw • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 08:33 PM

He's a divorce attorney and who's to say he doesn't have his own problems?

TerryYockey • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 04:12 AM

That's a quote I heard Rod Stewart use a few years back. It's a great one.

urpe • 111 points • 10 August, 2015 03:36 PM

He didn't do anything "wrong". The family court took the womans word over the mans word and another man got fucked by the system.

[deleted] • 33 points • 10 August, 2015 03:41 PM

I meant in the legal sense. The fact that this guy got a prenup means that he's no slouch. He knew the dangers of getting married and tried to protect himself against them. I'm sure he had access to lawyers who guided him through the process so where did they all go wrong? How can a contract like this be thrown out so easily?

Unpopular_But_Right • 70 points • 10 August, 2015 04:02 PM

He probably should have refused to proceed with wedding plans until she and her lawyers and his lawyers and witnesses all saw her sign it in triplicate with a hand on the Bible etc, so that she couldn't have a leg to stand on about an oral agreement.

And if you're a rich man and you want to marry a woman and she gives you shit about signing the prenup... don't marry her. Drop her like a hot potato, because clearly she's trouble.

jerpta • 11 points • 10 August, 2015 06:15 PM

Doesn't matter two hoots.

Her argument was "he agreed verbally we'd throw it out if/when we had kids".

Myself, I'm wondering if it would have made more sense to account for any children in the pre-nup itself. A clause, if you like, that says "this is how much you'll get if there are children". It'd be a lot harder to claim such an agreement existed when the contract plans for such an event, but IANAL.

trpftw • 7 points • 10 August, 2015 08:02 PM

Yeah I think the language in the prenup may have been bad.

"The parties agree that no oral argument or any exception can be made to this agreement and that there will be zero decision in any future to overturn this prenup unless specifically stated and agreed upon by both parties."

It makes it very clear that this prenup cannot be overturned or ripped up in the future unless both parties agree. They don't have to sign it otherwise. It's not coercion. No one forced them to sign.

I'm really betting that the prenup wasn't written perfectly.

jerpta • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 09:37 PM

A contract - any contract, no matter how cleverly worded - can be rewritten or torn up at the whim of a judge.

Doesn't matter how many clauses you put in that basically say "No backsies!" - for all practical purposes, that's exactly what happened here.

That's why I was thinking a clause that explicitly accounts for kids. I've heard of similar things going into a will to drive home the message: "Yes, I have thought of this

eventuality and here are the terms"; I was wondering if it could be used to similar affect in a prenup.

alecesne • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 10:07 PM

This is why you make sure that both sides have a lawyer present at the time of the signing. Also its better to include a clause whereby assets are divided based on your respective income contributions. The problem here was that the signing was too close to the wedding date, and the division of assets was "disproportionate".

Planner_Hammish • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 08:06 PM

Better would bet to have a clause that states no changes to the contract be made unless they are in writing, witnessed, and have been shown to independent legal council.

redditarcm899 points 10 August, 2015 04:27 PM **[recovered]**

That would be considered coercion, and would lead to the prenup getting thrown out.

CQC3 • 27 points • 10 August, 2015 07:21 PM

You gotta love it when exercising the freedom of choice is now considered coercion. She had no choice but to marry him of course, I mean *what else was she going to do?*

trpftw • 17 points • 10 August, 2015 08:00 PM

This is why I'm having trouble believing this case. Couldn't the case be appealed and overturned with another judge?

She had no reason to marry him. Coercion only works if there is threats, violence, or she had no choice. SHE HAD A CHOICE. I don't understand.

[deleted] • 18 points • 10 August, 2015 06:07 PM

Its coercion when men have terms for getting married but just "Using all her assets to her best advantage" when she uses the kids to get what she wants from him.

K

RoninUnderground • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 04:48 PM **[recovered]**

Not if you stand your ground when she later changes her mind. "Too late, bitch, I'll find myself a better woman."

urpe • 27 points • 10 August, 2015 04:14 PM

The family courts are stacked in the woman's favor. It was literally her word against his and the judge sided with her. This is why "do not get married" is so prevalent here.

Elodrian • 37 points • 10 August, 2015 06:44 PM

No, it's her word against a signed an executed legal document and the judge *still* sided with her.

Kid_Crimson • 9 points • 10 August, 2015 09:14 PM

Read for comprehension! Op stated that her argument was "he agreed verbally we'd throw it out if/when we had kids" and the judge sided with her.

watch_ping • 19 points • 10 August, 2015 05:29 PM

He knew the dangers of getting married

No he clearly didn't. There are so many "but my girl is a unicorn" posters on here thinking that their marriage is different and they understand the risk.

The entire system is stacked against you. It's not worth the risk.

RojoEscarlata • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 08:26 PM

I'm sure he had access to lawyers who guided him through the process

The judge took the word of the woman and trough out the hole thing just because.

He could have Keanu in the devil's avocate and would still lose.

sxales • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 11:20 PM

Sounds like his lawyers didn't add an integration clause. Check out the Parol Evidence Rule for more information.

spectrum_92 • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 02:16 AM

I feel like you're almost certainly leaving out some important detail...

putsch80 • 29 points • 10 August, 2015 06:45 PM **[recovered]**

I'm one of those lawyers who usually chimes in on this stuff about prenups. I only had to read a few paragraphs of the story to tell exactly where and how he fucked up. It's right here:

She originally refused to sign it, but a few days before her wedding, she agreed to sign after her husband promised her he would do away with the prenup once the two began to have children.

When he didn't have that prenup in hand at least 60 days before the wedding, he should have called the wedding off. By allowing her to wait until the last minute, it gave credence to her story that he made some new promise (that he would destroy it after they had kids) to get her to sign it. This is just another variation of the classic mistake of springing a prenup on your spouse right before the wedding.

Also note this was back in April 2013. In the last 2.5 years, there hasn't been some flood of prenups getting invalidated. That shows that the circumstances here are probably not quite what most of the commenters on this sub are pretending them to be.

[deleted] • 4 points • 10 August, 2015 06:56 PM

Why didn't his lawyers catch this? It's bizarre that they wouldn't have at least foreseen this possibility.

putsch80 • 11 points • 10 August, 2015 06:58 PM **[recovered]**

They may have. They may have told this guy, "don't rely on this prenup if she doesn't sign it at least a month before the wedding". This guy may not have told his lawyers that she had been refusing to sign it. Love makes people do stupid shit.

[deleted] • 15 points • 10 August, 2015 07:17 PM*

The court is essentially saying that this woman has no agency and rewarding her for it.

RealHumanHere • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 08:40 AM

Thank you very much for your input, always welcome.

So is it true that the last 2.5 years prenups haven't been thrown out? Do we see a change in mentality then? Do you think this will continue?

putsch80 • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 04:24 PM

I cannot say that any haven't been thrown out. There may have been some executed under duress, where full disclosures were not made, etc. However, the fact that this issue about the prenup getting thrown out made the news should speak a lot about what a rarity it is for that to happen.

I will also note that the New York Appellate Division (2nd Dept.), which is the same court that made the ruling that this story is about, has ruled as recently as June and October 2014 (after the case in the story was decided) that prenups are enforceable and that representations supposedly made regarding the prenup that are not in the prenup itself may not override the actual terms of the prenup. *McKenna v. McKenna*, 121 A.D.3d 864 (N.Y. App. Div. 2014) and *In re Fizzingolia*, 118 A.D.3d 994 (N.Y. App. Div. 2014).

So much of what happened in this story is just fact specific, and based on the fact that the husband was apparently very evasive in court (at least according to the court opinion) and therefore did not seem credible in his version of events.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 11:35 AM

There's two parts to this paragraph.

She originally refused to sign it, but a few days before her wedding, she agreed to sign

What's to stop a woman from crying duress 30 days before the wedding? The time seems irrelevant as long as the judge believes this part...

she agreed to sign after her husband promised her he would do away with the prenup once the two began to have children.

this is basically his word against hers since there's no proof of this verbal agreement.

putsch80 • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 04:15 PM

What's to stop a woman from crying duress 30 days before the wedding?

Because duress generally requires that a party be left with no reasonable alternative but to do something. The longer the period you have to act, the more likely it is that you have other reasonable alternatives. For example, canceling a wedding and getting at least a partial refund on some of the items (especially shit like cake, flowers, catering, etc) is much easier a month or two out than it is on the eve of the wedding.

[deleted] • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 08:59 PM

I just imagine any woman saying "he was emotionally abusive and said I had no choice but to sign it". And then putting the icing on the cake, "we had a verbal agreement outside of this contract" and getting it thrown out.

Whisper • 14 points • 10 August, 2015 11:37 PM

So, what did this guy do wrong?

He put a ring on it.

The only power you will ever have in a relationship is your power to walk away. There is absolutely no advantage to giving up that power.

AlphaJesus • 8 points • 11 August, 2015 12:52 AM

It's so freeing to realize that.

In the words of Robert de Nero, " Never have anyone or anything in your life that you can't walk out on in 30 seconds or less if you see the heat coming around the corner."

I've applied that in a Red Pill perspective.

[deleted] • 21 points • 10 August, 2015 03:42 PM

So, what did this guy do wrong?

he was stupid enough to get married.

and then secondly, stupid enough to think a prenup was his best option (when its not)

[deleted] • 13 points • 10 August, 2015 03:46 PM

According to the article, the agreement was signed only days before the wedding so her lawyer successfully argued that she was "forced" into signing the prenup. The prenup should be signed well in advance of the wedding and she should have her own legal counsel thorough the process.

[deleted] • 30 points • 10 August, 2015 03:55 PM*

Fucking jokes man. Next they'll say that the contract is only valid if both sides hatch a chicken's egg under a toad at 2 am under the luminescent light of a full moon.

redzorp • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 04:59 PM

Bahahahahaha!

I laugh. But in a decade or two some feminist attorney general will table a law with that exact wording.

And it will be signed into law with no criticism from society (except from some red pill sites).

bradbrookequincy • 8 points • 10 August, 2015 06:40 PM

Except in most states its very clear about what makes a prenup invalid. This idiot committed the number one mistake in prenup land - getting it signed at the last minute.

johnnight • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 08:21 PM

Your comment is good and the rest of the comments are low-quality rant.

Maybe all prenups can be thrown out on a whim by fem-activist judges, but this particular case still had that reasons, so it's not a definite proof for the TRP-preferred theory.

ARedSchoolofThought12 points 10 August, 2015 04:16 PM* **[recovered]**

Depending on the country, this guy should of hid his assets inside a trust before marriage. Then after the impending divorce, cut her a check for 1/2 his actual worth, not his trusts worth. Like "here's \$5k, now get out of my life."

Brave_Horatius • 16 points • 10 August, 2015 05:39 PM

This. This is how the real old money does it. The dead beat son gets a cheque monthly instead of a lump sum, gets the use of houses cars etc that are wholly owned by the Trust.

That way when he inevitably falls in love with a skank in a Atlantic City she doesn't get a payday.

Planner_Hammish • 3 points • 10 August, 2015 08:11 PM

A trust isn't ironclad either. The court could impute the value if you are the only one on the board of directors or whatever the case may be. I.e. if you have a degree of control over the money.

RealHumanHere • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 08:44 AM

This might sound stupid and sure is, but what if you put your millions before getting married on untraceable bitcoins? You can literally divide your wealth put them in many encrypted hard drives that you hide/keep around the world and no one could know where.

renegade • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 05:54 PM

He was coercive, and she didn't have representation. Either you have to both work with a lawyer together or you have to both be represented. If you want your prenup to stick you have to do it right. Of course this was almost 20 years ago, and we have the benefit of additional case law that helps us know how to do it best.

[deleted] • 7 points • 10 August, 2015 06:07 PM

His lawyers must've let him down then. They should have been familiar with the procedure.

alecesne • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 10:19 PM

Yeah, if you have 20 million, you hire counsel for your fiancée. Sometimes the cheap way is expensive, sometimes the fast way is slow.

renegade • 3 points • 11 August, 2015 12:49 PM

Another way to look at it is; if you are going to the trouble of being married do you want to be married to a) someone who may feel trapped/tricked and b) someone stupid enough to have fallen for that... If you can't respect her more than that you shouldn't be wrapping your life up with her.

HumanSockPuppet • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 11:15 PM

It doesn't matter. This could happen in only 1 out of 100 cases, and the fact of the matter would be that it's still a possibility.

You have to weigh the pros against the cons whenever you make a decision, especially for something like marriage.

Cons of marriage: divorce rape, financial ruin, the undoing of your life's work, and permanent estrangement from your children.

Pros or marriage: file jointly for taxes.

Fuck that.

King-Kuranes • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 11:36 PM

He didn't have her get a lawyer to look it over. After she made a big stink about the prenup and refused to

sign it he married her anyways.

Any woman that freaks about a prenup should be walked away from immediately.

Captain_Unremarkable • 7 points • 10 August, 2015 06:16 PM

This happens all the time in the U.S.

While my intuition tells me this is true, I'd be curious to see the actual numbers of % of prenups that are thrown out due to coercion.

[deleted] 11 August, 2015 03:54 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 07:07 AM

We know, it's shit. Everything favors them, but not getting married is a good start. And if they word laws to fuck men over too badly, maybe some people will wake up.

RojoEscarlata • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 08:27 PM

Someone should start killing all those judges who trough away prenups.

I'm not even joking.

CopperFox3c • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 08:46 PM

Nah, the simplest solution is just to not get married in the current climate.

Violence it the last refuge of the incompetent. - Isaac Asimov

RojoEscarlata • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 10:37 PM

I was *half* joking, but don't kid yourself violence gets results, and no moral is stronger than steel.

[deleted] • 121 points • 10 August, 2015 03:31 PM

And women wonder why men are opting out of marriage

GoldPisseR • 103 points • 10 August, 2015 04:07 PM [recovered]

They aren't. Thats the big fucking problem.

Because every woman no matter how big a slut will choose a stable rich guy with zero personality for marriage over a chad.

She'll of course keep fucking him on the side, but thats a diff point.

[deleted] • 35 points • 10 August, 2015 04:31 PM

Not all men are, but there is clearly a movement for men to avoid marriage. Marriage rates are declining and there aren't enough stable wealth guys suckers to go around.

Whether its the red pill men or the MGTOW movement. The men-opting out approach is real and reflective of declining marriage rates. If there are guys out there who still marry despite the increasing evidence of its increasing toxicity that is on them. There is no excuse given the preponderance of data and anecdotal stories about men getting screwed over.

[deleted] • 29 points • 10 August, 2015 05:23 PM

Even if that wasn't the case, most married men are miserable. No sex and can't even wank in peace. Maybe 1/10 are legitimately happy and not just delusional.

trpftw • 8 points • 10 August, 2015 08:38 PM

I don't quite understand this. Are women not interested in sex? Do they usually have lower sex drives? And if so, why do they go and fuck chad and cheat on their marriage? Are they not interested in stable families and raising children in a stable family?

None of this makes any sense to me.

ColonelMitchell • 14 points • 10 August, 2015 08:54 PM

Often times females are more attracted to the "feels" you give them. Once you're married the husband seems like old, boring news to the woman. They want something fresh, something exciting and unknown. This effect is multiplied exponentially if the guy becomes out of shape as time passes. And no, they're not interested in stability. Because feelz>realz(reality).

trpftw • 6 points • 10 August, 2015 09:01 PM

So what I'm wondering now is (this was something I think Neil Straus said), that you still have to work hard to KEEP the woman you're with during a marriage or LTR. Like you still have to make moves. If you get comfortable and let yourself go (get fat) or start neglecting to keep giving them "the feelz", then they lose feelings for you. That apparently you have to keep being a player even in your LTR.

So in that kind of situation, do you think if you stayed very alpha and kept things exciting, perhaps she wouldn't ever think about leaving etc. I think a lot of guys pretty much turn into their college/high-school-selves after they think they "got it in the bag" in a LTR, and the neglect starts adding up and the lack of emotional support etc. starts making the girl talk to other girls, and the other girls tell her to "get out more" or "meet new people" and that's when it all goes downhill.

What do you think of that?

So wouldn't it be possible to keep a wife or LTR if you're the kind of person who doesn't "let go" and become a slob/unattentive? I really really believe that a lot of guys I know, will put on a show and act really good for a while, but then they'll resort to being complete assholes who don't care about anyone but themselves if they get "comfortable with someone".

It's like roommates. At first, the roommate is on his best behavior, he acts all nice and does clean things. Then he turns into a slob once he gets comfortable with you, brings out his bad habits, and gets annoyed at things you do that shouldn't annoy anyone, and starts becoming this toxic person that you don't want to ever live with again.

ColonelMitchell • 4 points • 10 August, 2015 09:12 PM

There's a balance to be had. You have to show her that you'll love her and take care of her, but you also have to do your own thing. Yknow there's a reason why red pill doesn't suggest getting married. Because it's hard finding that balance. Your best bet is finding a woman that is less hard to keep committed.

[deleted] • 8 points • 10 August, 2015 10:01 PM

Yes, they have lower sex drives, and that sex drive is more responsive rather than initiating.

That is, if the right guy comes and gives them tingles, she wants sex, but it is driven from external circumstances rather than internally. Testosterone drives sex drive in both sexes, and it is 12-17x higher in men.

This is of evolutionary importance, since sex itself is enjoyed by both sexes (actually, often more by the woman), but having a higher sex drive means that men have to pay something extra to coax the gender with the lower drive to give it up. If they had equal drives, there would be no need for 'sweeteners' like commitment. Women's greater power in sexual relationships stems precisely from their lower sex drive. This is why married women can refuse sex until some other 'favours' are supplied, like repainting a room or mowing the lawn. As for not being interested in stable families, a consequence of being driven by feelings more than logic is a deficiency in long-term thinking, of seeing consequences for actions. She doesn't know what she will feel in the future, so can't plan for it.

trpftw • 6 points • 10 August, 2015 10:31 PM

Very fucked up.

That also probably explains why women don't initiate anything including "asking out" people being traditionally done by men.

Seems like they are using sex as a bargaining chip in negotiations. But what happens if a guy himself has low sex drive, and the woman has much more. I wonder if that leads to a happier relationship.

through_a_ways • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 05:18 AM

I wonder if that leads to a happier relationship.

It would be an inadvertent form of natural dread.

[deleted] • 3 points • 11 August, 2015 04:37 AM

The only reason why women are interested in "stability" is because "stability" = provisions. That meaning the kids are being fed, she can buy some basic bitch Michael Kors gear, and have the luxury of going on vacations now and then.

Women can just transfer that "stability" from a husband directly into their bank account and kick the guy out of his own family's home though. Look at all the feminist propaganda out there lately that teaches people that divorced households can be perfectly healthy and how dads are unnecessary.

I think TRP is living proof that a broken nuclear family will result in a whole generation lost. Daughters wind up in abusive relationships, think that flashing their tits is social activism, and are more likely to just make general poor life decisions. Sons who grow up without a father are way more likely to become involved in gang activity if they live in a bad area, become involved in some illegal activity/get arrested/wind up in jail, or they just become some soft body fuck boy who gets pushed around and doesn't know how to stand up for himself.

Obviously, this isn't always the case.. And sometimes people from really good families wind up fucking up; but I live in a working class town and grew up on the wrong side of the tracks. I work in an upper middle class typical suburban town and the difference is night and day.

Maxxxz1994 • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 03:06 AM

Im a redpillor who wants to get married because I want a cute little daughter to take care of (there's nothing more in the world that I want), and she needs to have mother/father figures in her life. Plus the fact that my family and relatives would crucify me in the town square if I had a child outside of marriage.

[deleted] • 50 points • 10 August, 2015 04:59 PM

I've seen two friends post some shit mocking modern marriage, with an image of a wife cheating on her husband and walking away with everything. The 20 year old dudes are waking up, I promise.

woofitout • 17 points • 10 August, 2015 05:20 PM

I've seen two friends post some shit mocking modern marriage, with an image of a wife cheating on her husband and walking away with everything. The 20 year old dudes are waking up, I promise.

Posting funny images online really doesn't mean shit. Everyone does that, including the people that the image makes fun of. If those 20 year olds actually stick to the not getting married idea, then props to them, but IMO there's zero correlation between posting one of those images and actually following through with not getting married when you've got some "unicorn" begging you to do so.

[deleted] • 4 points • 11 August, 2015 04:40 AM

Posting funny images online really doesn't mean shit. Everyone does that, including the people that the image makes fun of

The subs "nice guys" and "just neck beard things" are perfect examples. You know those places are flooded with clueless little beta blue pill dorks who think they're above that...

Sherlock--Holmes • 0 points • 10 August, 2015 07:42 PM

The 20 year old dudes will have next to nothing to choose from anyway. Women are apparently all lesbians now.

woofitout • 9 points • 10 August, 2015 05:17 PM

All kinds are getting married.

I've got a "main" group of friends where the vast majority are not married, despite being in very long term relationships. There are a few engagements and "promise rings," but no wedding dates set. Basically the guys succumbing to the woman's pressure to "get married," but seem to be pushing it off as long as possible. Some smarts there.

I've also recently started hanging out with a "new" group of friends. I've known two of these guys for years, and have met most others here and there. Even though the groups of friends are all around the same age, same background (everyone is from Eastern Europe), very similar social/economical status, etc., everyone in the second group is either recently married, or about to be.

The guy I've known longest in the second group is not your typical macho alpha, but he's got great game, was a successful (local) DJ at several night clubs, very social, tons of friends, high SMV, etc. Has been with the same girl for 6-7 years now and is getting hitched in a week. One of the other guys (whom I just met for the first time a few days ago) is very clearly alpha, and he's getting married in a few weeks, too.

Everyone in the two groups is from 24 to 31 years old, and pretty much everyone is fully onboard the marriage train. I can only guess how many of these couples will be divorced within five years.

rp_divorced • 20 points • 10 August, 2015 04:57 PM

there's always a man willing to marry these women. The only change is that these women are having to lower their standards to lock down their beta bucks. Which we all know will lead to even more divorces down the road.

Tarnsman4Life • 21 points • 10 August, 2015 05:27 PM

It takes self respect and strength to say you'd rather be alone than settle for an Alphas left overs, something most men simply do not have. I wouldn't even say its 80%, I would say it is closer to 90 or 95% of people are so terrified of "being alone" that they would marry a woman who has seen more cock than the piss trough at Wrigley field during the 7th inning stretch.

I don't have firm numbers, but if you are an Alpha and at the top of your SMV what percentage of American women are really suitable/worth the risk of getting married and knocking up?

[deleted] • 29 points • 10 August, 2015 05:45 PM

Once you're on the other side. When you finally experience what it's like to be a girl's Chad, the fact that they'll do almost anything sexually, you can never look at women the same way.

I'm not even attractive and I've had a few of those experiences; I can only imagine what it's like for the tall, broad shouldered, deep voiced, classically handsome men.

Personally I'd rather die alone, than settle for a woman that spent her 20s swallowing Chad's load.

[deleted] • 18 points • 10 August, 2015 06:02 PM

Ain't that the truth.

Same boat here; I am far from an attractive man. However, once you have the experience of being a girls chad and spinning plates there is no way to go back (and why would anyone want to).

Count me in on the die alone crowd, I would never settle for a woman who has seen more traffic than a major highway during rush hour. AWALT

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 08:45 PM

I would never settle for a woman who has seen more traffic than a major highway during rush hour. AWALT

AWALT means that they have the same propensity to certain actions, but it doesn't mean they've all had the exact same life experiences. There are women with low partner counts, even if they're very rare.

rp_divorced • 18 points • 10 August, 2015 05:31 PM

Every single American woman will turn on you given the right circumstances. They all know it's an easy payday with virtually zero risk.

Tarnsman4Life • 8 points • 10 August, 2015 05:36 PM

Always, ALWAYS AWALT yes any woman will turn on you if you lose frame. But seriously, women who are actually worth that risk, who have not ridden the CC till they fell off, who don't have deep seeded psychological issues and have no problem being the traditional wife. We are talking about what..1 in 100 American women? Maybe 1 in 50?

The pool seems extremely small these days of women who are worth the risk.

[deleted] • 7 points • 10 August, 2015 08:41 PM

But seriously, women who are actually worth that risk, who have not ridden the CC till they fell off, who don't have deep seeded psychological issues and have no problem being the traditional wife. We are talking about what..1 in 100 American women? Maybe 1 in 50?

You need to add several zeroes, my friend. It's not a new problem, but it's gotten far worse.

"I found one upright man among a thousand, but not one upright woman among them all." — King Solomon, circa 950 B.C.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 01:31 AM*

This man understands and he learned the hard way.

Do not get married



RealHumanHere • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 08:51 AM

What I don't get is why they don't move to South America, or East Asia (Philippines, Cambodia, etc), there are amazing countries where you can be a king with western money.

You can simply find a young, catholic, clean girl very easily.

Tarnsman4Life • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 12:32 PM

Why do men go into the wild and hunt dangerous animals? The thrill. These wealthy men convince themselves that NAWALT and that they are so cool, wealthy and fly that they can somehow tame the beast that is 90+% of American women.

To take some very famous advice, you can't turn a hoe into a house wife, hoes don't act right. CC riders are basically hoes so there you go.

HoundDogs • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 03:34 PM

What bothers me is the audacity of the judge to throw out the prenup based on nothing but someone's word. She marries into the money, destroys her family, destroys her cousins family, never produces a penny and still gets rewarded. Unbelievable. It's cases like this that the public needs to be aware of.

dicklord_airplane • 180 points • 10 August, 2015 03:55 PM

a similar thing happened to my good buddy when he was 27. he got married after dating a girl for 2 years, and it was largely because they both came from traditional catholic families. they had to get married before they moved in together or else their families would have made life hell for them.

he brought a shit load more assets to the marriage because he had already graduated college and had a good professional career going. before he met her, he bought a nice townhome for cheap right after the economic crash in 2008, and the place shot up in value. (real estate is a great investment if you're patient and wait for an economic scare, by the way). after they got married, he bought her a car, paid for her full-time college tuition so that she could finish her bachelors, and also paid the bills and mortgage. he paid for her entire life, basically. he was a pretty darn good catch in terms of financial stability.

she started cheating on him after about 2 years of marriage with a guy in her college courses. she wanted to come clean but was too much of a coward to tell him, so she started leaving her phone out so that he would

eventually see that she was getting messages from other guys.

they had a fairly amicable break up considering everything. when they got divorced, he was crushed and didn't want to fight over anything so he just agreed to split their net assets 60% for him, 40% for her including the profits from the townhome that he sold when they decided to divorce. this means that she got a huuuuuuge cash payout because she brought nothing to the marriage besides a bit of debt.

TLDR: she got free tuition, a free car, free room and board, and was entitled to a huge portion of the sale of a home that she did not pay a single cent into. she got all of this by cheating in her marriage.

Epilogue: after all of this, he moved in with me and decided to quit his professional career as an engineer and become a snowboard instructor. he's got a lot of confidence and game, and he's been using and abusing women ever since. i witnessed an upstanding man who would make a fine husband and father get chewed up by marriage and transformed into an uncaring player who seems to take pleasure in playing with girl's feelings. the traditional path for men turned out to be a trap for him. i went through a similar transformation, but at least i didn't get married and i wasn't so badly hurt that i formed sadistic feelings towards women.

this story is a microcosm of western culture's trajectory. it's broken.

_whistler • 160 points • 10 August, 2015 04:14 PM

Epilogue: after all of this, he moved in with me and decided to quit his professional career as an engineer and become a snowboard instructor. he's got a lot of confidence and game, and he's been using and abusing women ever since. i witnessed an upstanding man who would make a fine husband and father get chewed up by marriage and transformed into an uncaring player who seems to take pleasure in playing with girl's feelings. the traditional path for men turned out to be a trap for him.

Where have all the good men gone...

Elodrian • 6 points • 10 August, 2015 06:53 PM

How do Catholics feel about pre-nups? Has Rome ruled on that topic?

[deleted] • 13 points • 10 August, 2015 08:32 PM

Well I don't have an answer for you, but ideally Catholics are not supposed to get divorced, so I would assume the church says that there is no need for a prenup.

ioncloud9 • 6 points • 11 August, 2015 01:23 PM

Former Catholic here. Catholics can never be divorced in the church's eyes, so getting a pre-nup is both pointless and a terrible way to start off the "lifelong" marriage. That said, I've seen plenty of very conservative Catholic marriages split. They legally divorce but the church still considers them married so they basically have to be celibate for the rest of their lives to avoid being in sin, which pretty much none of them do.

spectrum_92 • 5 points • 11 August, 2015 02:20 AM

Well the strange thing about pre-nups from a Catholic perspective is that on the one hand, they appear to set the marriage up on shaky foundations, implying that one partner doesn't trust the other. But on the other hand, considering divorce is totally unacceptable according to Catholic doctrine, it shouldn't actually be a major problem as - ideally - divorce is not ever going to occur anyway.

Trengingigan • 3 points • 15 August, 2015 09:25 AM

Italian Catholic here (well, ex-catholic). There is simply no divorce in the Catholic Church, so no pre-

nups. If both partners express a conscious and free consent to the marriage, the sacrament is valid and indissoluble until death. If a religious court verifies that the consent of one or both spouses was defective in some way (not sincere, not free, or not mindful of all its implications), the marriage is declared null, that is, it never really happened, the couple was never married.

Everything else (pre-nups, economic aspects of the separation etc.) are just things the Church is not concerned with and are thus handled by the civil courts.

redpillbanana • 3 points • 11 August, 2015 09:11 AM

People generally do what they are incentivized to do.

Work hard, get married, build a career, be faithful to one woman, and then pay through the nose in a divorce?

Or drop out and pump-and-dump hot snowboard chicks?

Philhelm • 3 points • 10 August, 2015 08:15 PM

The anguished wailing of a woman is like Gregorian chant to me. Such sweet music they play.

GoldPisseR • 46 points • 10 August, 2015 04:03 PM*

Its just unfathomable for me why rich fucking guys would bet half their shit on a modern whore. Downright suicidal

Also surreal that no matter how accomplished and established some guys are ,they just lose their senses when a woman comes along

draketton • 35 points • 10 August, 2015 04:36 PM

Self-made rich people spend so much time building their career that they have no opportunity to learn from experience how women treat men. Without an instruction manual like TRP that's a bad road to go down.

Tarnsman4Life • 20 points • 10 August, 2015 05:25 PM

This is why Charlie Sheen went with hookers; he could hire a cook, hire a maid, get arm candy celeb dates for Hollywood stuff and he decided to hire women for sex to avoid exactly this situation.

It is not worth the risk anymore; even if you don't put a ring on her finger, some gold digging bitch comes out with woodworks with false rapes claims ala Kobe. Looks like some random bar pussy is accusing my favorite athlete Patrick Kane of rape. I am sure he will be found not guilty but will have to settle out of court just to shut the chick up.

[deleted] • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 03:12 PM

he has two ex wife's that he pays for though

[deleted] • 3 points • 11 August, 2015 04:46 AM

A lot of those rich guys are the guys who spent their whole lives playing by the book and doing the right thing; like Tyler Durden before his apartment burned.

trpftw • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 08:50 PM

But it's like how can you know right? Do you not trust your buddies in activities that can be life-threatening or dangerous physical sports that you wouldn't do with an untrustworthy person? Have you never lent money to someone? At some point there is a matter of trust and no one expects their wife or someone they have

loved so much and have ample evidence of their love, would eventually betray them.

Not to mention that there are still something like 40-50% who are married and nothing bad happens there.

Point is that much of the divorce horror stories, are from women who are clearly irrational or vindictive/abusive, with a sense of entitlement. Something you would think you would figure out before marrying someone.

I just feel that it is human tendency to see the worst cases and draw a pattern. That it's not worth the risk. But what if you want a family or you meet someone who is pretty much perfect? Will you still stick to your principles and not marry them despite everything making sense?

OrpheusV • 41 points • 10 August, 2015 03:50 PM

So basically a prenup needs these to be effective, and even then the judge can just go LOL NOPE and throw it out?:

A clause that this is not subject to change and legally binding. Oral agreements cannot override this document in any way shape or form unless done in the presence of a public notary and done in writing as well.

A clause for adultery immediately denying the cheating party any benefits during the divorce, and is 100% irrevocable.

Detailing making it absolutely 10000% clear what goes where if the relationship fails. Make it clear that whatever was brought into the relationship by each party is their own property. If someone brought pots and pans into the relationship, they're clear to leave with those items.

Clauses making it clear what is expected of each party in the relationship, and basic clarification on custody of children(if any), where assets go, etc?

Shit, even that isn't enough? What the fuck.

Cyralea • 31 points • 10 August, 2015 04:33 PM

One of the clauses of a proper prenup is that the division is seemingly fair. Which is the most bullshit, subjective metric you could possibly imagine. A judge can decide it's not fair because he has the gynocentric view that she is entitled to money, no matter what, and simply chuck the prenup out.

OrpheusV • 4 points • 10 August, 2015 04:43 PM

No clue if this is so, but can those bullshit rulings get appealed under a different judge? Unfortunately not knowledgeable under how civil cases work.

[deleted] • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 06:52 PM

It can but im pretty sure it basically just gets back round to the same judge/the judges uphold each others rulings often times. Also most guys cant afford to appeal

zyk0s • 3 points • 10 August, 2015 06:25 PM

I haven't heard of any case of an asset distribution order like that being appealed. Normally, you can't just go to a different judge, you can appeal to a higher court (for regular civil cases, regular court -> superior court -> supreme court, not sure if this also goes for family law cases), and you need to state grounds for the appeal. Grounds are either a misuse, concealment or fabrication of facts or evidence, or a faulty interpretation of the law by the presiding judge. You also need to show that you brought these issues up before a judgement was made.

Now, if a judge throws out your prenup, I don't know how you can claim misinterpretation of the law. If it's their personal assessment of the meaning of the contract, or if they think it was done under

duress, there's not much you can do. In terms of facts or evidence, since divorces are no-fault, there's also not much you can use.

Appeals are hard to get, it's not just a matter of not liking a judgement, you need to build a case for it. Plus, they're costly, so at some point it might not be worth the money anymore.

trpftw • 3 points • 10 August, 2015 08:42 PM

I don't get how throwing out a legal contract is not grounds for an appeal.

The idea of duress has to be imminent. It cannot be that the woman was under duress for decades, then why aren't there criminal charges? Why didn't the woman go to the police after signing the contract?

I don't understand how such a thing cannot be appealed. The judge used his own subjective assessment to throw out a legally binding contract. That's like the very basis of appeals, a misinterpretation of the law or a contract or ripping up a contract that was legal. The whole point of courts is to determine whether contracts or laws were abided by. I'm pretty sure throwing out a contract is grounds for appeal.

And I highly doubt that an appeal costs more than getting slapped with splitting of assets.

And why would there be that much cost to an appeal?

zyk0s • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 09:07 PM

I'm not a lawyer, but I did take some law courses in college.

The judge didn't throw out a legal contract, he declared the contract invalid under duress. And you don't understand what the concept of duress means. It does not mean she was fearing for her life for decades. It does not mean the person who coerced her did something criminal. There doesn't even need to be a person applying duress. All duress means is that extreme external circumstances made the person act in a way different from how they would normally act. That's where the legal theory stops, and where the judge must make a determination whether it applies. Since that is at the judge's discretion, it can't be grounds for appeal.

And there is a cost to everything in courtrooms. You need to build the case for your appeal, which takes lawyer time and therefore costs money. You have filing costs. It's not cheap, and like it or not, money is a barrier of entry by design, to prevent every single case from being appealed and counter-appealed.

My law prof joked that there are two places one should never go to voluntarily: the hospital and the courtroom. Not getting married probably helps in avoiding both.

trpftw • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 09:45 PM

That's very interesting.

So duress and coercion doesn't mean duress or coercion anymore. It just means whatever the judge feels like? How does that make any sense in legal theory?

I feel like law professors must be hating their own legal system no?

It seems illogical to have the judge define whatever he feels like as duress/existential circumstances and then you can't even appeal because the judge decided that way?

cover20 • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 04:26 AM

If the prenup is otherwise OK, I think it's considered fair to keep what you came in with, even if that is

way lopsided. It's the way the wealthy protect their fortunes routinely. When a big fortune marries a bigger fortune, a prenup routinely assures that if there's a split, the fortunes leave about as they came. The ruling families in the US want it this way. I don't think it's going to change for some feminists. Besides feminism is going out of style. Look at the shit Megyn Kelly is getting for pulling the vagina card on the Donald.

[deleted] • 14 points • 10 August, 2015 06:46 PM

Family law is nothing more than a scam industry engineered over several decades to steal money and destroy families. I don't think this is a misandry thing, after all, you do hear of the occasional man getting paid alimony by the rich wife. I believe it's just business - they basically just screw over whoever has the most income (which 9 times out of 10 is the man), in hopes the man will keep "appealing" aka pumping more money into their ~~criminal~~ legal (by their own definitions) but disgustingly immoral enterprise.

Think about it, who writes family laws? Family law attorneys.

Who enforces family laws? Family law attorneys "elected" as judges.

Who profits from family laws? Family law attorneys.

Seeing a trend here?

We talk a lot here about "until laws change" but think about what that would take to happen. We would have to get not one, not a few, but *the majority* of local, state, and federal representatives to change the system for us. So who are these representatives? You guessed it: attorneys. In fact, IANAL but I'm pretty sure you have to be a family law attorney just to RUN for family court judge, and an attorney just to RUN for state office, meaning that no matter who we campaign for/against, we'll always end up with somebody who we're asking to change the system against their own self interests.

The only way I can see to defeat this system is to starve it to death. Or, in other words, **don't get married, ever.** Don't let your friends get married. Don't let your kids get married. Boycott the system altogether. Expose women who beg for marriage as the scam artists they are.

grachuss • 11 points • 11 August, 2015 05:15 AM

I started buying 4 unit apartment buildings a few years ago. The next 12 months should bring me buildings #5 and 6. Yet my 28 year old grocery store cashier gf can't figure out why I don't want to get married.

I tell her why and she goes ballistic. I'm not budging however. I've worked too damn hard to get to where I am, and I'm not about to be taken for a ride.

nefuratos4 points 11 August, 2015 11:46 AM **[recovered]**

Is your gf super hot and is there any reason you're not dating someone on your level?

grachuss • 6 points • 11 August, 2015 01:43 PM

Yes I live in a tiny town with 800 people. She is the best I can do at the moment.

[deleted] • 2 points • 12 August, 2015 07:22 AM

Good on you, stick to it. She doesn't deserve your hard-earned shit, dude. If you have money there will always be bitches to hang by you to leech.

Do it, to it! That's my new catchphrase.

fucks-like-a-tiger • 19 points • 10 August, 2015 04:14 PM

This is only one of the many reasons men with money don't get married. There is no such thing as an ironclad

pre-nup. Even if it's not thrown out, the defense costs can be staggering. Attorneys bill by the hour. Avoid the risk. Fuck marriage.

grass_cutter • 3 points • 10 August, 2015 05:14 PM

The ironclad way is to literally hide money in some offshore account far away from government (or spousal) knowledge whatsoever.

bradbrokequincy • 7 points • 10 August, 2015 06:52 PM

This sounds good but is not practical. All international bank accts need declared on your tax forms and lots of logistical stuff. But the biggest issue is your money sits idly by and makes no investment returns. My diversified stocks and real estate have doubled in value in 5 years. In offshore accts no growth of assets which is how you grow wealth over your lifetime.

grass_cutter • 5 points • 10 August, 2015 07:59 PM

I have zero doubt there are offshore investment accounts. I mean honestly, what the fuck do you think Mitt Romney is doing? I'm not dumb enough to get married, so I don't personally have to worry about it.

and re-read my post. You're illegally 'hiding' it from the government and taxes. So yes the IRS "says" to put it down.

Patranus • 38 points • 10 August, 2015 04:08 PM **[recovered]**

I am sorry, but if this happened to me (as a business owner) I think I would literally go postal on her. There are few things that would make me break and this is probably one of them.

[deleted] • 26 points • 10 August, 2015 05:03 PM

Honestly anyone stealing my money, as an ex-junkie hits a spot of me that is irrational and murderous. You don't fuck with my money. I didn't want to work to begin with, my hard-earned money??, oh fuck that.

sofcknwrong • 6 points • 10 August, 2015 11:41 PM

As her husband AND an ex-junkie, if she 'disappears', you'll be lucky if you ever see daylight again.

[deleted] • 13 points • 10 August, 2015 04:48 PM

If more men went postal females would think twice before trying to fuck them over.

Demonspawn • 11 points • 10 August, 2015 08:25 PM

It's not the women fucking them over. It's the government doing it on the woman's behalf.

Go postal on the judges rather than the women. Change will happen a lot faster that way.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 01:34 AM

Judges enforce the idiotic laws congress makes...those are the regards we need to tar and feather

Demonspawn • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 05:36 AM

Either are agents of government, and government only listens to two things: the will of the 55% female majority vote, or the potential revolution that will make that vote moot.

HoundDogs • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 03:42 PM

This is the issue. All of the fault here lies in the government enabling lying psychopaths. They're the ones that threw out a legal contract because she said it didn't count. They're the ones who give women money who earned nothing over half of everything. They're the ones who steal children away from their fathers. They're the ones who believe the word of the woman with no other evidence with regard to abuse.

EVERYTHIGN we are seeing is a result of the government's actions. If they treated women as actual equals we wouldn't have a problem.

redzorp • 27 points • 10 August, 2015 05:41 PM

I doubt it. Over the decades more than enough men have in fact gone postal and, if anything, those incidents were used as a collective excuse for even more draconian feminist laws (violence against women act, etc>)

[deleted] • 11 points • 10 August, 2015 06:03 PM

Yeah you are right. No Marriage No kids is punishment enough for these succubus.

jerpta • 13 points • 10 August, 2015 06:23 PM

Oh, they'll get the kids all right. Same way women have always got the kids. "Forget" to take the pill and/or go fuck Chad without protection while making sure to use protection with Dave the Provider.

"Oh, I'm pregnant! Damn, condom must have failed!"

(meanwhile, Dave is thinking to himself "strange, I check it every time.....")

ChadThundercockII • 3 points • 11 August, 2015 03:28 PM

The condoms companies say it is 99% protection against STDs and most of them assure you that their shit is unbreakable. I trust them but I don't trust women.

jerpta • 2 points • 12 August, 2015 09:43 PM

They are if you use them right - pinch out the air, hold it as you pull out (which you do as soon as you've finished), don't put your cock near her until it's covered, don't use fingernails to open the packaging.

Lots of people don't.

ChadThundercockII • 1 point • 13 August, 2015 02:16 AM

What you said is common sense. I don't see how people fuck it up.

cover20 • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 04:07 AM

If the woman is narcissistic, going postal just gives her the narcissistic supply she craves. Not the best way forward. You want her to seek her supply elsewhere, while you are implacable.

Bloody_Anal_Leakage7 points 10 August, 2015 08:37 PM **[recovered]**

Don't go postal on the women, they're simply looking out for their self-interests at the expense of others. Its in their nature.

Lynch the judges that think upholding this with the force of law is okay.

[deleted] • 5 points • 10 August, 2015 04:59 PM

I would prefer to spend the remaining millions to make life a living hell for her until the day she died. I would rather burn the money just so she couldn't have it.

[deleted] • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 07:51 PM

I'd just leave the country. easy

getRedPill • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 08:44 PM

What *postal* is supposed to mean?

vzhu • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 08:38 AM

You don't need to kill, maim or disfigure someone to destroy all they hold dear.

musclebound92 • 14 points • 10 August, 2015 05:48 PM

Why the fuck do judges side with women no matter what. Are they so controlled by their dicks that they can't say no to a woman.

Demonspawn • 12 points • 10 August, 2015 08:29 PM

Why the fuck do judges side with women no matter what.

Women control 55% of suffrage. All judges are either elected or appointed by those who are elected.

newls • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 10:21 PM*

All judges are either elected or appointed by those who are elected.

Seriously? That surprises me. In the UK it's very important that they're appointed, not elected. I suppose a lot of it is political at that level anyway.

However there's a bit of modernist nonsense creeping in, they're looking to hire people for their race and sex instead of how just and incorruptible they are:

The Commission also has a specific statutory duty to “encourage diversity in the range of persons available for selection for appointments”.

And plenty of judges are white knights, the family court system still heavily favours women regardless of circumstance, and women still get much lighter sentences for exactly the same crimes.

The SJW government in Scotland (faithfully funded by English tax pounds, mind you) has even abolished women's prisons altogether. The mind boggles.

chostax- • 5 points • 10 August, 2015 07:42 PM

You're implying all judges are males, although I'm sure the majority are.

through_a_ways • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 05:35 AM

They're not thinking with their dicks, they're thinking with neoteny.

MattyAnon • 6 points • 10 August, 2015 07:54 PM

Instead of a marriage with prenup, simply do not get married.

Even if the laws change in your favour: laws are fickle. Society will pull the rug from under you and redefine the

law of marriage to be whatever it wants it to mean, LATER. Bait and switch.

The marriage contract you sign today is not the marriage contract that will be enforced against you in 5,10,20,30 years time. We have learned this. This has happened already.

If everyone gets a prenup, they could simply make prenups illegal. Simple as that. And boom, instantly you've got zero protection. Ironclad protection? Oh hell no, they just made it illegal.

The laws of marriage have already changed once. Don't think that even if it looks like a good deal now, it always will be. And right now it looks like a terrible deal.

IF men stop marrying and *IF* the deal for men improves, this will be made to only apply to *new* marriages. Feminists will see to this. "Fuck... we need to get married... but men won't... ok, let's make new marriages slightly better for the men, but without improving the deal for those suckers who already signed".

Read TRP. Look at how men are treated. Look how much society cares about you and your money, resources, rights. Look at the past as the best indication of the future, and act accordingly.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 07:25 AM

Good point dude. They've never cared. If they are throwing you a bone, seemingly, it's because they need you for something. And if seems to good to be true, it probably is.

ShitfacedBatman27 points 10 August, 2015 04:26 PM* **[recovered]**

I watched the movie Divorce Corp. Everybody needs to see that movie. US Family Courts are anarchy. If you really want to win, buy the shit out of the judge. Seriously: *buy the judge*. Bribes, death threats, whatever you gotta do. Or get married in a different country.

If you attempt a cohabitation situation, get out of the commonlaw trap by making it look like she's a renter at your house. Retrofit the paperwork if you have to and LIE YOUR ASS OFF IN FAMILY COURT as necessary. Tilt the fuck out of the playing field.

ChadThundercockII • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 03:39 PM

Thia right here. If the law is crooked, bend the shit out of it and lie your teeth out.

shinslap • 5 points • 10 August, 2015 06:01 PM

That's the good thing about being poor, I know my wife is with me not for money

One_friendship_plz • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 08:58 PM

What do you think about faking that you're poor?

Philhelm • 6 points • 10 August, 2015 08:18 PM

I'm really surprised that these judges and divorce attorneys don't wind up dead more often. It honestly puzzles me.

rp_divorced • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 08:56 PM

When two people are getting divorced, the focus is almost solely on the other spouse and how you can screw them over. The lawyers love this because they can run up the bill and most divorces are settled outside of court so judges aren't even in the picture most of the time.

London-Bananas • 8 points • 10 August, 2015 09:01 PM

And even here on TRP there are people defending marriage *in this fucking thread*

spicedncoke • 15 points • 10 August, 2015 04:54 PM [recovered]

I actually read the article. Here's where the husband cocked up:

"Before Petrakis married Peter Petrakis in 1998, she was presented with what her lawyer called a "heavy handed" prenup that would give her \$25,000 for every year that she and her husband were married, but nothing more. She originally refused to sign it, but a few days before her wedding, she agreed to sign after her husband promised her he would do away with the prenup once the two began to have children. He did not destroy the prenup, even after they had children, according to his estranged wife."

So according to the article:

He put the ring on it

They set a wedding date.

He then throws a pre-nup on her, she refuses to sign.

Wedding date gets closer, she then agrees to pre-nup on condition hubby drops it after kids.

I agree that she's being a greedy bitch for basically saying \$25k/year is not enough. But, c'mon, anyone with half a brain would realize that the pre-nup would not hold up if she signed it 2 days before the wedding with a date already set.

If he didn't set a wedding date, she couldn't claim duress. Simple. But yea, if you're gonna marry, marry up in financial resources. She can't hit you for divorce rape and can't use you a BB.

Elodrian • 7 points • 10 August, 2015 07:09 PM

But, c'mon, anyone with half a brain would realize that the pre-nup would not hold up if she signed it 2 days before the wedding with a date already set.

If this scenario were playing out last month I'd agree with you. What did the relevant case law look like twenty years ago?

HoundDogs • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 03:49 PM

I don't see what the wedding date has to do with it at all.

Elodrian • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 04:21 PM

The practice of judges invalidating contracts because they are unfair by 2010's standards may well have been unheard of in 1995. The idea that a contract signed in close proximity to a wedding is invalid could be a new idea which only gestated in the case law in the years since this contract was made. He might have fully believed his ass was covered and been given sound legal advice representing the state of the art of the day, only to have his protections legislated out from under him by activist judges and divorce attorneys over the ensuing twenty years.

HoundDogs • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 04:52 PM

Ok, i see what you meant now. I'm still having a hard time understanding what the date the contract was signed compared to the date of the wedding has to do with any of this?.

Tqbfjotlds • 1 points • 11 August, 2015 05:15 PM [recovered]

The logic (if you can call it that) is that it is an embarrassment to the woman if the wedding is cancelled. Her reputation gets tarnished, so the husband is apparantly forcing her to sign the document under duress.

HoundDogs • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 05:22 PM

Well...her reputation is stellar now.

cptspiffy • 3 points • 10 August, 2015 07:14 PM

If he didn't set a wedding date, she couldn't claim duress. Simple. But yea, if you're gonna marry, marry up in financial resources. She can't hit you for divorce rape and can't use you a BB.

I'd love to see some case law on this. My wife makes more than I do, but I'm not confident that that'd save my bacon if we ever went to court.

rp_divorced • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 09:32 PM

It's not really a man/woman thing, it's a higher earner/lower earner thing. The man is usually the higher earner which is why they are on the bad end more.

Kyfhomyoba • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 10:35 PM

The screenwriter for *Legally Blonde* got divorced and has to pay her ex-husband \$8000 a month and she's throwing a **fit**. Now that women are the majority of college graduates, and hence, higher earners. expect a little push back on this matter.

rp_divorced • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 11:40 PM

I know a few women who are paying alimony and all of them are seething deep down because "a woman should never have to pay a man" but they all divorced their husbands because they were the lower income earners and didn't respect them because of it.

cptspiffy • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 01:56 AM

That's good to hear. I took a big cut to do something I love and spend less time away from my kids. She wasn't happy about it but that's too bad for her. Kids come first.

cover20 • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 04:19 AM

They miscalculated, assuming their vaginal privilege would assure they would not have to pay. This makes me happy.

I think the message is that if you feel the wife's affection growing cold, lose your job. Preferably you want to be earning less than she is.

Sherlock--Holmes • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 07:48 PM

How is signing it within 48 hours of the wedding considered "duress?" She's under no duress to sign it or get married, especially if it's his money paying for the goddamn wedding.

rp_divorced • 3 points • 10 August, 2015 09:31 PM

right or wrong, it's a surefire way to get the prenup thrown out

They call it duress because the invitations have been sent, the deposits have all been paid, the extended family is already arriving in town so the wife feels forced to sign under the circumstances.

BallisticTherapy • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 08:13 PM

But you're lower on the ladder & are likely to get hypergamy'd.

HoundDogs • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 03:48 PM

I haven't seen any evidence that he said he would drop the prenup after kids. If I had to bet I'd say that she made that up and she's lying (which she has proven to do in the past).

Also, a signed contract is a signed contract. There's no such thing as "duress" in the case of a wedding. Duress is if you hold a gun to someones head or threaten them with violence. Threatening to call off a wedding with a greedy whore (his instincts were right) is not duress, it's intelligent.

HumanityInPeril • 20 points • 10 August, 2015 04:01 PM

Rising 2L here, this shit happens all the time with ANY type of contract. However, this greedy whore made off like a bandit. Hopefully the state Supreme Court (or whatever they call that court level in NY they are weird) will pick up the case and reverse it. I'd also like to note I'm married and it is the biggest mistake of my life. We have two amazeballs kids (as they are my offspring... I did paternity tests) and I only stay with the shrew until post law school when I can divorce her and still be able to see my girls every day. Of course the whore will rape me financially for the next X amount of time with alimony but at least I will get to be with my girls and help them to not be a stupid slut like their mother.

[deleted] • 16 points • 10 August, 2015 04:58 PM

Why not divorce during law school so she can keep half your negative net worth.

grass_cutter • 5 points • 10 August, 2015 05:13 PM

Maybe he wants to handle his own case lol.

Just kidding no one is doing that shit fresh outta law school. He'll be raped by the courts and lawyers like everyone else. Talk about trial by fire.

Justathrowaway • 7 points • 10 August, 2015 06:46 PM **[recovered]**

It's crazy how first year law students seemingly know more than twenty year vets and s-m experts.

Listen young pup, a lawyer's credibility is his currency. Spend it at your own risk. You have no idea what you're talking about. I know it plays to what many of the people here want to hear, but contracts being thrown out is an extremely rare occurrence. Parts of contracts? Less rare. I bet you didn't even read the article.

tl;dr: avoid internet "lawyers" and "law students" and their opinions, especially on anonymous forums.

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 04:39 PM

Did you marry a whore? What happened? I understand awalt but when did you realize you wanted divorce? Without doxxing yourself.

[deleted] • 21 points • 10 August, 2015 05:29 PM

This is why the world needs deadpool and assassins.

[deleted] • 9 points • 10 August, 2015 04:22 PM

If you want to have kids, how are you supposed to do it while protecting yourself in the US? I fully believe AWALT and prenups don't mean shit anymore... so even marrying the perfect LTR red pill girl you still risk getting divorce raped. Seems impossible to have children without taking a huge risk

[deleted] 10 August, 2015 04:58 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 6 points • 10 August, 2015 05:50 PM

Fair enough, but you still have no legal control over the children at that point. The mother could take them away and get child support from you overnight if she wished - when I say have kids I meant have children that will 1) have your last name and 2) you are there to be a father figure to them and raise them up right to make sure they don't get sucked into the blue pill mindset taught by single mothers.

This is, of course, assuming you can convince a GF to have your children which I doubt is an easy task. All of them will want to get married first, will be some serious shit tests to pass to achieve this

netgrey4 points 10 August, 2015 06:19 PM* [recovered]

You have no legal control anyway even if you are married.

[deleted] • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 06:59 PM

Maybe not equal control but certainly more control than having none at all, fathers still win custody etc. Its rare but it still happens

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 07:26 AM

maybe if you can get her to inject the meth IN COURT..

cptspiffy • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 07:16 PM

Not an ideal situation, but you *can* assert your paternal rights within 6 months of the birth, even in a maternal state. This will make a huge difference should any custody issues arise down the road, married or not. In my state (Nevada), this costs about \$20.

lindependentmale • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 10:27 PM

Fair enough, but you still have no legal control over the children at that point.

Not true. As their father, you have just as much control as their mother, regardless of your marital status.

The mother could take them away and get child support from you overnight if she wished

She can do this whether you're married or not.

Courts are doing a better job these days of granting shared/joint custody to fathers. It used to be women were effectively given full custody by default, but these days if you demand joint custody she's going to have to make a valid counter-argument against your parenting abilities. Assuming you're a good father and she can't validate an attack on your character or inability to parent your children, she's not going to be able to take the kids away permanently. Unfortunately, this process could still cost you several years and tens to hundreds of thousands of dollars depending on how long she can afford to keep dragging the legal battle out.

A wise man would give serious consideration to the idea of never having children. I went and got snipped. Admittedly, this was a much easier decision because I already had two kids with my ex-wife and was in my early thirties. I don't know if I would have been able to choose this path as a childless young man in his twenties... tough call.

rp_divorced • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 01:58 PM

Not true. As their father, you have just as much control as their mother, regardless of your marital status.

Not necessarily. If an unwed couple has a child, the biological father is not legally the father unless he signs the birth certificate or raises the child as his own for most of the child's life. If he doesn't, he then has to register as the "putative father" (if such a registry exists in his state) to have the paternity of the child determined by the courts.

BlackHeart89 • 3 points • 10 August, 2015 07:34 PM

For some, its worth the risk. I have no problem with paying child support. But I can't stand behind paying alimony. That shit is retarded. Especially considering that most women work. Married or not.

redzorp • 5 points • 10 August, 2015 05:55 PM

It is a huge risk and you can never protect yourself 100% in the US.

But for all the talk here in the manosphere of prenups being thrown out (and we SHOULD talk about it) what gets lost in the noise is that the VAST MAJORITY of prenups do NOT get thrown out.

So yes, it is still a huge risk. But with the right attorneys, right prenup, drawn up in the right way in a more than reasonable time frame before a marriage - the risk is mitigated. It is never zero but can be reduced to "almost-acceptable" levels.

What "almost-acceptable" means will vary from individual to individual.

Of course vetting the woman is the single most important factor above all else. If you marry a worthless whore - you will get worthless whore end results. If you marry a saint (who can be trained to be good in bed) then *maybe* just *maybe* you can make it long term without getting destroyed.

All in all, way to risky for me and just not worth it, since I am not yearning to have kids. But if I ever change my mind on kids, then I would spend a good two years researching and preparing a pre-nup, BEFORE I even started dating prospects. I would also structure my finances in a series of trusts co-owned by my sister and brother, whom I trust above all limits. In other words I would hide assets LEGALLY. Then, I would only marry a woman who was goddamn near perfect and, like Donald Trump, update the pre-nup every five years.

Or fuck it, just donate some sperm to a sperm bank so my genetics live on and live my life MGTOW style: banging sluts, training jiu-jitsu, travelling the world, making money, hanging out with friends, meditating on mountain tops, smoking pot, dropping acid and enjoying the unconditional love of my dog!

[deleted] • 5 points • 10 August, 2015 06:06 PM

I wish there was a way to combine MGTOW and also pass on your genetics. I personally identify more with the MGTOW movement but where I disagree is the concept of never having children. By not wanting kids you are essentially ensuring your genetics die out, you don't make it to the next round, after millions of years of evolution your blood line dies with you with no ancestors to carry it on. Seems wrong to me, although there is immense risk in marriage/having children - the basic purpose of organisms is to pass on their genetics to the next generation. I see this line of thinking similar to suicide in which the desire to not want to live anymore goes against basic biological function which indicates something is not right with the brains function.

Thats my personal thoughts anyway, take them for what theyre worth

fewforwarding • 13 points • 10 August, 2015 09:17 PM

Men are so desperate and stupid. Is having a pussy around the house really worth \$500,000+? Apparently it is.

[deleted] 10 August, 2015 04:54 PM

[permanently deleted]

BlackHeart89 • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 07:32 PM

Shiiiiit. 10k can change a man's life. It'll change her's too. If you get my drift.

[deleted] • 4 points • 10 August, 2015 07:10 PM

I'm of the opinion that perhaps at least in the USA, and not anywhere else, assuming you want an LTR with kids, it may be possible, although not ideal to have a CEREMONIAL marriage with reasonable trappings, but NO LEGAL marriage.

However, one commenter posted awhile back that in South America, they turn mere cohabitation in to marriage, and who knows what could be brewing in various jurisdictions around the USA. Certainly not me at the moment.

Also, if you get a sham marriage for her social proof, you're still supporting something that ensnares other men, although I guess you could look at it as a Darwinian practice wher you pretend to do something stupid as a competitive strategy to gull other men into doing it.

[deleted] 10 August, 2015 10:01 PM

[permanently deleted]

cover20 • 4 points • 10 August, 2015 10:55 PM

I think this story is a population control psyop. It's an old story being brought back up. But realize the following:

(1) She signed the prenup right before the wedding. It's supposed to be 2 months or more, apparently, to show lack of coercion.

(2) He supposedly made this verbal agreement that the prenup would be void when the kids came. Why would that not be in writing? Did he deny it? If he denied it, the judge should have assumed such an agreement did not exist.

(3) Subject to safeguards such as (1), lawyers here have said that a prenup is likely to be ironclad when it comes to alimony or asset division.

(4) And there's little point to living together or being traceable at all, and having kids without marriage. DNA test, paternity proved, you must pay CS regardless of married status. And a prenup can have no effect on this. This is the one area where a prenup does NOT work.

(5) Do check paternity if there's any doubt in your mind. Never ever pay for another man's child.

coin8300 • 5 points • 11 August, 2015 01:32 AM

Fuck this; we need to actually do something about this shit. All these white knight pussy legislators caving into womens demands need to be dealt with and the BS laws they passed reversed. That goes for marriage laws and some rape laws. Nothing will happen until we demand it.

eaton80 • 14 points • 10 August, 2015 03:56 PM

Squirrel climbs tree, in other News at 11.

Tarnsman4Life • 6 points • 10 August, 2015 05:21 PM

This is why you never get married, ever if you are a successful man. You get one activist cunt of a judge and bam, prenump thrown out like it was not a legally binding contract because of ma feelz and you are fucked. Family Law among other things has made Marriage a worse investment than buggy whips.

Honestly; if you make 30K a year and you ain't got shit to your name, do it if you get the right chick, fuck it, they can't take blood from a stone, work off the books. But if you are a HNWI you'd have to be insane to place a bet where you lose half your money 60% of the time.

Magnus_Leo • 3 points • 10 August, 2015 11:24 PM **[recovered]**

This makes my blood boil. I will read this tomorrow for a good preworkout pump.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 07:29 AM

This is what keeps me in the rage phase.

Madison • 3 points • 11 August, 2015 10:33 AM

Why the fuck do people still get married? The financial benefits are nowhere near good enough to offset the risk of losing more than half of everything.

[deleted] • 6 points • 10 August, 2015 11:48 PM

I would just have her killed. God can judge me not some pompous sjw judge prick.

[deleted] • 6 points • 10 August, 2015 04:40 PM

Easy enough to handle. Include a no oral modifications clause..."all changes, modifications, alternations, or amendments to this agreement must be in written form, signed by both parties to be enforceable."

Sounds like shitty lawyering.

watch_ping • 4 points • 10 August, 2015 05:38 PM

Until the judge decided that your clause is unfair because "muh interpretation"

the_red_scimitar • 7 points • 10 August, 2015 05:20 PM

OP has added "facts" that are not in the linked story, and are suspect.

Read the story, but here's what he said that have no support from the story:

That's what she says, that he made an oral agreement with her. She has no proof of this promise or this oral agreement, its just his word against hers.

What the story actually says:

She originally refused to sign it, but a few days before her wedding, she agreed to sign after her husband promised her he would do away with the prenup once the two began to have children. He did not destroy the prenup, even after they had children, according to his estranged wife.

The couple separated, and a court ruled on Feb. 20 that Peter Petrakis had "fraudulently induced" Elizabeth Petrakis to sign the prenup that hung only on a verbal promise.

There is nothing here that says she "has no proof" - nor does it say she had proof. For all we know, the husband admitted he had said it. Or not. The point is, OP altered the content to be more sensational.

Not that the story doesn't have merit without the alteration. Pre-nup signed, woman had affairs. But the feminine agenda removes all agency from women (one of the stupidest thing they do to themselves). Their method of fighting the "patriarchy" is to give it ALL the power, pretending they are somehow winning.

But hey, logic isn't their forte, even when they say and think it is. There are a few exceptions, but by and large, as with TRP canon in general, it's about the preponderance, and you'll rarely meet one who actually uses logic in

any personal way.

anomanderrape[S] • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 05:29 PM

How the hell does a judge establish that they made a verbal agreement? It just boils down to "he said, she said". The only way I can see there being any form of proof is if the husband admits to it, which I doubt he did.

cptspiffy • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 07:18 PM

How the hell does a judge establish that they made a verbal agreement?

There might have been witnesses. Don't count on the press for an accurate story; they just want to get people riled up for more ad views.

thenarrowpath • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 05:37 PM

It sounds like he came to her with the pre-nup a couple of weeks before the wedding. This is why when doing a pre-nup you must communicate with your future spouse about what it is you two want in it, then seek out separate lawyers and have them draft it together. When one party goes off and gets an attorney to draft something up to their liking, then of course shit will get thrown out. Ultimately, just don't get married, cohabitate if you really desire children and some form of "marriage" life. Just do it in a state that doesn't have common law marriage. Otherwise talk to an attorney about how to protect your assets.

bradbrookequincy • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 06:47 PM

If you have assets and get married in some states "premarital property" as long as not comingled stays with the person who owned it before marriage. Judges seem to rarely fuck with this as its the exact law. Judges seem to like to flex their muscles and prenups are an easier target since they are just contracts to fight about. Best case IF you get married is to be in these states and get a prenup. I have not had any friends not keep their premarital assets in these states even with no prenup. Best is no marriage but if you do strong prenup will often work but you must know their are risks.

-IIII-----IIII- • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 07:30 PM [recovered]

What the fuck is wrong with these Beta Billy judges?

How fucked up is our society when any woman can just make up stories and *by default* be given the benefit of the doubt?

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 07:32 AM

Just for this incident, this man has forfeited his right to life in my opinion. You are doing what was once a sacred duty, overseeing the splitting up of a marriage. This is fucking disgusting, imagine a judge did this against a woman?

Jooceyjooce • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 07:34 PM [recovered]

A hit would not cost nearly as much as he stands to lose. I would just have her killed.

rp_divorced • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 07:47 PM

I think losing your freedom is a much greater cost.

Jooceyjooce • 1 points • 10 August, 2015 07:48 PM [recovered]

If you pay someone to do it that has no ties to her the risk is pretty low.

rp_divorced • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 07:52 PM

They always go after the husband first, especially if a divorce is recent or imminent. That's a very risky game to play.

edit: see this article. One of the most powerful men in Charleston, SC who had plenty of money available was busted because the hit man passed out in the middle of an intersection while looking for drugs and confessed everything. <http://www.postandcourier.com/article/20140805/PC16/140809719>

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 07:33 AM

What a dumbass, do it like the Sopranos, give the junkie half the brick of heroin, and then the other half when it's done.

yummyluckycharms • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 09:49 PM

There are dark web sites that provide a variety of services up to and including murder. They use bitcoin to pay for their services

A colleague hired a rent-a-goat to beat up a cyclist that dinged his Mercedes and refused to pay for it. Transfer of funds, and receipt of photos proving that the guy got what was coming for him ensures that both parties are happy. Its not an ideal situation but thankfully the idiot took the same route everyday and wore pretty unique set of clothes. Wasn't as expensive as I thought it would be (note: bit coin fluctuates in price).

I would probably use the same service if I needed to enact some justice but remain arms length away.

nishnasty • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 08:09 PM

Honestly, if he's a savvy individual in real estate he has most of his assets tied up in real estate investments and irrev trusts so that technically nothing is in his name - so she'd only receive the most minimal amount. They could put their entire house into a trust for all we know as the trustees are his family and friends. Just a thought.

rp_user • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 08:22 PM

Q: How to make a Pre-nup iron clad?

A: By never getting married.

anomanderrape[S] • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 08:27 PM

De facto's can also get you pinned down according to laws in some countries, so be careful.

rabidrabbity • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 09:58 PM

Hookers are way cheaper in the long run and they are always ready for sex and stay perpetually young.

rabidrabbity • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 09:55 PM

He's got money. He likely has connections. Soon, bitch ass ex-wife will be swimming with the fishes. Problem solved.

[deleted] • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 01:18 AM

How many men will just cut their losses and move on instead of divorce raping their ex? Women are dangerous!

redmeatball • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 02:08 AM

I bet this will get overturned. At least I hope.

Ex-AlodianKnight • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 05:49 AM

He needs to just pay up some grease money bro. \$100,000 worth of it.

[deleted] • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 02:24 PM

The fucked up thing is that a prenup has to exist in the first place. The law allows a woman to completely fuck over your career and finances given a divorce is in the daily weather forecast, and now you have to insist that she signs a document to prevent that from happening. What?

The fact that a guy has to insist she signs the documentation just seems to be a set up. It's like him saying "My love, I have a lot of assets and you could potentially steal them from me if you decide you want a divorce or I catch you fucking chad." "You're right hubby let me sign that paperwork so I don't divorce rape you up your ass."

It just seems so fucking backwards to me.. It's like if Target made all of their customers sign some document saying "don't steal from our stores if you don't feel like paying for something."

HoundDogs • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 03:22 PM

Well it's a good thing a legal contract can be dismissed based on the word of a lying, cheating bitch with the mind of a child.

Doctor_Mayhem • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 05:24 PM

This is why I now say that if you are a rich man, why in the fuck would you get married? A good whore is worth her pay, and worth her weight in gold.

Here's my plan if I ever get rich: I'm gonna find the hottest, cleanest hooker and pay her something like 120k per year to give it up on demand, whenever I want, with the option for her to leave at any point, with a bonus if she refers a sufficient replacement upon leaving.

Seriously, why would anyone want a wife at this point? What do western girls have to offer other than sex? They can't offer companionship, as they are nothing but ruthless competitors. They can't cook. They aren't honest. They don't know how to even clean a house, and if you're a rich man, you can afford a maid.

Western girls are only good for sex, and if you're a rich man, just buy a whore and put her on contract. A 6-figure salaried whore is still cheaper than marriage.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 07:01 PM

this really isn't a bad idea.. When I consider the average cost of dating, this idea sounds more and more appealing..

Doctor_Mayhem • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 07:21 PM

I'm telling you, bro. American girls have nothing to offer. Though, if you're rich and famous, you won't need hookers, and can afford to just take a flight to Ukraine or Russia and grab a wife up from there. Either way, even with those options, this method is still soooo much better than dating or marriage. The hassle you save is worth the price in and of itself.

Aids_by_Google1 points 11 August, 2015 09:20 PM **[recovered]**

Why buy the cow when you can get the milk for free. Stay in shape, date, plate whatever - sex on tap.

Doctor_Mayhem • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 02:31 PM

Of course, if you're a rich man, this (plating) is a far more viable option than if you're a regular joe. In

fact, I'd say you should combine both. Have your personal whore, and plate whatever you feel like. I will say again, a good whore is worth her pay. Especially if she can shut the fuck up. Also, with my method here, there is no ambiguity. She's there to do a job, and she knows she can't fuck around, or she's gonna lose a sweet meal ticket.

But as you said, "Why buy the cow when the milk is free?" Because the milk is never free. First rule of economics: Nothing is free.

brokenshelf • 4 points • 10 August, 2015 03:37 PM

The real question to me is: how in the world do you write up a prenup that doesn't have provisions for adultery? That's like...the whole point.

IVlaskerade • 10 points • 10 August, 2015 03:48 PM

It doesn't matter what the prenup said, because she got it thrown out.

OrpheusV • 4 points • 10 August, 2015 03:49 PM*

Wouldn't matter, even if one was drafted, she lied and had the prenup thrown out.

If there was a clause in there making it clear that the agreement can only be modified if done in writing and it got tossed anyways, what the actual fuck.

RoninUnderground4 points 10 August, 2015 04:46 PM **[recovered]**

People love to throw the prenup argument at you when you say "Don't get married because you stand to lose half your assets in divorce." This is what I throw back. Prenups don't mean shit if a judge can toss it out on utterly baseless conjecture.

[deleted] • 4 points • 10 August, 2015 05:56 PM

And tell this story to any woman as a reason for not wanting to marry even with a prenup and she will say, "NAWALT".

And when she says, "NAWALT" you know she IS like that.

BallisticTherapy • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 07:59 PM

I'd reply with the firearm analogy.

"NAWALT and NAFAL (Not All Firearms Are Loaded), but it would be folly not to treat them as they were. That's basic safety/the precautionary principle & what prevents your balls getting shot off."

NeoreactionSafe • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 05:10 PM*

We need to keep repeating this again and again.

Real Marriage is now Illegal

The original Marriage 1.0 contract specifically protected men from loss of children and loss of property.

In the old days they would say:

Until death us do part.

...but today the laws have been rewritten and now one might say:

When our gay feelings of love fade we part.

I've thought that a better idea might be to simply promise that if a woman produced two or three biologically proven offspring (test the DNA with an actual paternity test) then you would **reward** her biological fidelity with a marriage contract.

Once the babies are born and proven so you aren't a cuckold the laws are pretty much equal either way. The only difference would be alimony. Child support is required whether married or not.

The prime reason to avoid marriage is to be certain of your DNA in the children so you don't end up a stupid cuckold for Chad the Cad ThunderCock.

And if you don't want kids then that's yet another reason not to marry.

zpatriarchy • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 03:33 PM

don't get married

Sepean • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 06:23 PM

The prenup was signed just a few days before the wedding. That's a surefire way to get the prenup thrown out in court.

Prenup 101: Get it signed a long time before the wedding.

He either got shit legal advice, or he ignored it.

Sherlock--Holmes • 3 points • 10 August, 2015 07:54 PM

I actually signed a contract AT THE CLOSING of my house that had stipulations I didn't like. Get that fucking thing thrown out!

-rwsr-xr-x • 1 points • 11 August, 2015 11:15 PM **[recovered]**

I actually signed a contract AT THE CLOSING of my house that had stipulations I didn't like. Get that fucking thing thrown out!

Sounds like you had a horrible real-estate agent. My agent went through every letter, space, crossed-T and dotted-I, three times, before I initialed any page of the contract. We redlined plenty too.

Sherlock--Holmes • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 12:10 AM

It didn't really happen. It was just an analogy.

Tqbfjotlds • 1 points • 11 August, 2015 05:01 PM **[recovered]**

When I read this story again, it says that she initially did not sign the pre-nup and signed it just days before the wedding. This means that he gave her the pre-nup well in advance and she knew that he wanted her to sign it. She was not pressured to sign it at the last moment.

I think it is entirely possible that she knew that a pre-nup signed just before the wedding would not be enforced. He gave her the pre-nup in advance and she just dilly-dallied with it, with the explicit intent of making wedding preparations first and then signing it at the last moment. Looking at it this way, she was not coerced. In fact, HE was manipulated into making wedding preparations first while she led him on that she would sign the pre-nup. At the last minute she tells him that she would sign the pre-nup only if he promises to revoke it after the kids are born. Think about this, he has probably invested more into the wedding

financially and can be pressured into not calling it off at the last moment.

Sepean • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 06:04 PM

I'm not saying it is fair. I personally think the whole "coerced just days before the wedding" argument is silly, it is just a wedding not a gun to the head.

But this is how prenups work. Sign it just before the wedding and it will get thrown out. This is Prenups 101 and that is what this story is about. The cheating is irrelevant.

Again, I'm not saying I agree.

[deleted] 10 August, 2015 04:42 PM

[permanently deleted]

dragontx • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 06:05 PM

I'm not versed in family law maybe someone can answer this question for me. Is there an appeal process if one disagrees with the ruling?

rp_divorced • 2 points • 10 August, 2015 06:12 PM

Yes, but judges are allowed a lot of leeway in family law under the pretense of "best interests" and "being equitable" so many cases are never appealed because of the expense.

wordjedi 1 points 10 August, 2015 06:58 PM* [recovered]

In some countries, being in a LTR with someone where you move in together and live together for some time as de factos can still grant the ex-partner your assets should you break up.

Also not living under the same roof is a great way to keep your daily finances separate. LAT is the way forward if/when people get tired of Tinder. Combine that with a **legally binding** shared parenting agreement and you have a modern replacement for marriage, with less financial risk for men or risk of losing their children to the whims of divorce court.

hirjd • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 10:21 PM

Oh god. Once the feminist activist judges find out about LAT no man is safe.

iamlenb • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 07:05 PM

Would having his assets placed outside of her reach in foreign accounts help? Or having set up a trust for himself? Other than not getting married, for the person dead set on self-rape whats the best course of action to ensure that they get lube and a reach-around?

rp_divorced • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 07:58 PM

Quit your job or make sure you're underemployed so that the wife will be the breadwinner, and when she divorces you (because she will because you don't make enough) she'll owe you instead of the other way around.

BlueFreedom420 • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 07:23 PM

When you have over 1 million dollars in your bank account, a red book should arrive mysteriously in your mail and detail every red pill truth.

n8dawwg • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 07:26 PM

I need someone with law experience explain to me how an admitted cheating whore gets alimony? She broke the grounds of marriage, how does she get shit?

rp_divorced • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 07:48 PM

most states are no-fault. A woman can fuck another man right on your lap, run down to the court house and file for divorce and the infidelity won't even be an issue.

n8dawwg • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 07:58 PM

That concept is so archaic. Poor bastard!

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 07:34 PM

Can't we just get politicians to repeal all alimony laws? They are outdated in modern times. Women can work at nearly any job a man can.

rp_divorced • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 07:46 PM

Many states have, and many states are trying. One of the big issues is that most politicians are lawyers and lawyer's income will suffer with changes in alimony so they don't want to harm their peers too much...if at all.

yummyluckycharms • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 09:42 PM

Thats a very good point. Honour among thieves, perhaps?

stringerbell • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 09:05 PM

No wonder you didn't mention the only important bit here...:

She originally refused to sign it, but a few days before her wedding, *she agreed to sign after her husband promised her he would do away with the prenup once the two began to have children. He did not destroy the prenup, even after they had children*, according to his estranged wife.

They made a verbal contract - and the husband reneged on that contract. That's why the judge threw it out - because they agreed that it would be thrown out, yet the husband was dishonest and didn't do it.

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 09:38 PM

So she says. There's no proof presented that proves this is what happened.

yummyluckycharms • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 09:41 PM

A verbal contract with no proof? Binding? Hardly

The key takeaway that some people don't understand is that a prenup is mostly used as guidance by the judge to aid in their decision - it can be ignored at will.

cover20 • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 10:48 PM

The story doesn't say whether he agreed that he had made this verbal contract. It's important of course. If he disputed making that contract, he should win. Maybe the "parol evidence rule" applies here, that if a contract is in writing, amendments must also be in writing. That's what I recall of business law, any lawyers can chime in here ...

redpillalphamale1 points 10 August, 2015 09:06 PM **[recovered]**

Benefit of living in Quebec is that you can live with a woman for decades, have kids together and not get fucked over by the law if you're not married and separate. You need to have a list of items each party purchased though in case of separation. Also, you still get some of the financial advantages of married couples.

cover20 • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 10:46 PM

I would like to see a better legal analysis. But the story says she signed the prenup just days before the wedding. I've read here and elsewhere that the prenup should be signed at least two months before the wedding. This is how you rebut the idea of coercion.

Not blaming the guy, maybe this wasn't known at the time. Hope he gets it reversed. The ex wife is a bitch.

Moldy_Gecko • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 11:09 PM

What I don't get is this guy is RICH... couldn't he have got Johnny Cochran Divorce Lawyer or something? Or did he just assume Open/Shut and his lawyer on retainer was good enough?

Rawpick • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 11:10 PM

Did the movie liar liar not cover this? Might be wrong, defo not going to check... Lazy is I

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 12:36 AM

Protect your assets.

You can do this if you own nothing.

Some families I know do this with trusts their parents own and operate, and then buy the house/car/etc and keep it in their (parents') name. Kid owns nothing. Not beneficiary on anything. Nothing to legally go after since it's all in the parents' name.

I've not seen any cases where someone was able to successfully sue the parents for (and receive) money.

Protect yourself!

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 01:40 AM

Women aren't responsible for their own decisions, dontchaknow?

changshuaidiao • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 02:11 AM

This is a case of him losing frame. Verbal agreements are binding, and he made one with her when he explicitly told her that he would throw it out. When you're a millionaire man you don't make promises like that, you say "take it or leave it bitch." She would have agreed to the prenup as it was, he just needed to have a spine and follow through completely.

FUCK_YEA_GLITTER • 2 points • 11 August, 2015 02:55 PM

I think the worst part of that is she could have been lying because she had no evidence that he ever said he'd get rid of the prenup

quieroser • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 02:31 AM

Cringe Fest© <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LVMTOmSD6bk>

Stonish • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 04:25 AM

Just wow... Are all judges so beta or why is it happening? I lost it...

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 05:45 AM

So what does a prenup do then ?? Just a bait ?

crosenblum • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 10:50 AM

This is not merely a sign of anti-men, it's more of a sign of the endless corruption that lives in our culture.

That corruption of values that is always about seeking power, at any cost, regardless of who it affects.

Lord Acton said it best, "Absolute Power, Corrupts Absolutely".

This case like many many others, is truly tragic.

Because there are multiple victims here, the children, the man, and I bet that woman will never really be happy, because of her endless pursuit for money vs a real relationship.

Cases like this truly destroy families. And that is sad.

JestersHat • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 11:12 AM

Solution: don't be richer than your wife ;-)

koji8123 • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 12:52 PM

I would legitimately murder if this was done to me. Life in prison would be worth it.

CaioSlater • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 02:29 PM

Once again, I came here clean, and once again, leave TRP enraged. That's why I'll never get married, you'd never be sure enough if this is going to work out. Relying in humans is dumb, relying in women is beyond stupidity.

HoundDogs • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 03:54 PM

I'm very tired of seeing stories like this. It's just not worth it any more for people. I happen to be married. I'm pretty good about game so I don't anticipate that's going to go south, but I just can't say the same for young men any more. For a long time I was pretty accepting of people who wanted to get married but, at this point, I just can't do it any more. I will now ACTIVELY discourage my friends and family from getting married. I won't do it at the dinner table but I'll find some way. I'll do the same on Reddit and in my online presence. It's just not worth it for young men any more until this shit changes.

TekkomanKingz • 1 point • 11 August, 2015 06:21 PM

YOU HAVE TO GET THE PRE-NUP SIGNED 30 DAYS BEFORE THE MARRIAGE CERTIFICATE IS SIGNED GENIUSES THAT'S WHY IT WAS TOSSED OUT UNDER "DURESS"!!!!!!

fake7272 • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 04:48 AM

guys there are simple ways to fix this, hiding money is an American past time. I know not all of you are American, but if half my fortune was at stake, id figure out a way to hide that shit quick

ErasmusOrgasmus • 1 point • 12 August, 2015 09:20 PM

Question: assuming this guy's SMV is high as fuck, what is the reason why a post-wall wife would leave him?

Do the divorce incentives outweigh her hypergamous desire to stay with this millionaire when she doesn't have the looks to do better?

SeekingTheWay • 1 point • 29 January, 2016 02:28 PM

being a millionaire doesnt mean high smv, its just high one of the aspects of smv. for all we know he could be the betamax

nonameyetgiven • 1 point • 14 August, 2015 03:54 PM

Is this cross posted in /pussypass?

[deleted] • 1 point • 23 November, 2015 12:49 AM

This sounds very American, not like this in other countries.

[deleted] • 1 point • 22 December, 2015 10:40 AM

I know this is late but couldn't you appeal to higher a court?

NevrEndr • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 05:58 PM

isn't a signed prenup a legal document? I don't understand how a judge can throw it out? Makes no sense but also - fuck this lady. She's now teaching other women how to screw over their husbands in divorce proceedings? what in the actual fuck

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 August, 2015 07:31 PM

Well... Now that anyone can get married to anyone else, marriage has lost its meaning. So there's no need to get married. Just shack up and say you're in love. Throw a party for family. But no paperwork. what's the difference?

At least that's how I'll spin it if I ever have a girl I like pressuring me.